

John Urell
James Aldworth
Robert S. Hemstad
Byron H. Beswick
Joseph E. Blattman
Kenneth A. Matheson
Thomas J. Johnston, Jr.
Richard C. Browning
John L. Herndon
Laurence J. Stien
Richard B. Fielder
Claude O. Barnhill, Jr.
Thomas J. Norman, Jr.
Walter W. Vatcher
William "L" Beach
John F. Cox
John J. Leogue
William E. Brown
Joseph Keller
Karl T. Keller
Earl W. Cassidy
Donald C. Mitchell
James E. Graaff
Raymond E. Wase
Raymond E. DeMers
Malcolm G. Moncrief, Jr.
Otis E. Millenbine
Alexander J. Gillis, Jr.
George L. Winneberger, Jr.
Robert G. Klein
Gerald J. Maire
William W. Eldridge, Jr.
Richard A. Polen
George A. Parant
Herbert C. Reed
Edward W. Turcotte
Lloyd B. Dochterman, Jr.
Edward H. Rice
Charles W. Weitzel, Jr.
Daniel R. Kingsley
Albert H. Risner
Richard E. Moody
Boyce L. Lassiter
George L. Wineriter
William M. Sigler, Jr.
Walter B. Patton
Bevan G. Cass
Thomas F. McGraw, Jr.
Albert C. Schoner
Dwight E. Mayo
Robert W. Hohl
Richard J. Schriver
Robert B. Clay
John W. Walker
John E. Shields
Roscoe R. St. John
David G. Swinford
William J. Longfellow
Richard A. Bauer
Norman G. Ewers
Roger A. Morris
Harold O. Jones
Raymond M. Smith
Oliver R. Davis

Nolan A. Green
John P. Kelley
John T. Moore
James P. Bell, Jr.
William Shanks, Jr.
Dean W. Lindley
James W. Nelson
George J. King
William M. Russ
Willmar M. Bledsoe
Laurence "H" Woods
Richard H. Kern
Norris D. Allen
Hardy V. Huffstutter, Jr.
William C. McGraw, Jr.
Dee E. Ezell
Floyd K. Fulton, Jr.
Edward P. Stamford
James S. Ashman
Charles J. O'Malley
Kenneth A. Anderson
Lewis L. Miller
Clayton R. Ingraham, Jr.
Jack J. Howlett II
Robert M. Fraser, Jr.
Rex C. Denny, Jr.
Arthur E. Phillips
Clyde R. Jarrett
John J. Hilburn, Jr.
Rockwell M. Rutledge
Eugene V. Goldston
John J. Filippio
Frederic T. Watts, Jr.
Norman W. Flinn, Jr.
Robert R. Klingman
William J. Nichols, Jr.
Jack Lee
Edward N. Lefalvre
William C. Parker, Jr.
Gordon R. Reier
Austin C. Fitzgerald
William H. Drewitz
George H. Smith
Joe M. Prater
Harold L. Sharkey
George Bezbezan
Amil K. Clark
Robert G. Williams
Daniel H. Linebaugh
James A. Hoey, Jr.
Clifford E. McCollam
Robert A. McMullen
Charlie J. Dunkley
John A. Hughes
Roger B. Thompson
Neil E. Barber
John J. Rausch
Lester D. Flory
Francis G. Miller
Lucian C. Gifford
John J. Dalton
Samuel F. Leader
Patrick H. Mucciaccio
Alfo B. Ferazzi
Cornelius Overstreet
Charles A. MacCrone
"C" "L" Haney

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold R. Mackey
George F. Good III
Kenneth R. Snyder
Lemuel C. Shepherd III
Reuel W. Stephens, Jr.
Robert L. Gover, Jr.
Foster W. Blough
George A. Babe
Elmer J. Anderson
Joseph Koler, Jr.
William F. Young
Lawrence J. Bradley
Thomas C. Shanahan
Elvin R. Coon, Jr.
Donald F. Hillmer

Ewald A. Vomorde, Jr.
Philip H. Ronzone
Robert A. Foyle
William J. Vetter, Jr.
Ralph G. Dekle
Frederic A. Gessner
John J. Bozek
William M. Vanzuyen
Jack M. Lerond
Donald L. Hall
Charles R. Munn, Jr.
Arthur C. Beverly
Howard E. Reese
Michael L. Cannon
Robert J. McNicholas
George L. Peters

Louis Baerlsweyl, Jr.
Wilber F. Taylor
Richard D. McClintic
William R. Medlock
Roma T. Taylor, Jr.
William H. Macklin
James G. Webster
Charles F. King, Jr.
Bertram F. Pryor
Sidney H. Hilliard, Jr.
Neal E. Heffernan
Joseph L. Davis
William R. Lipscomb
Jack R. Hansen
Guenther W. Lenfer
Charles A. Merrill
Earl R. DeLong
Joris J. Snyder
Lewis R. Webb
John F. Miniclier
John E. Quigley
William A. McClelland
William T. Hickman
Nicholas A. Canzona
Chew E. Lee
James A. Horn
Alvin W. Burri
Robert E. Barde
John E. Dolan
Donald L. Mann
James H. A. Flood
Carl Pedersen, Jr.
Clair "F" Runyan
Charles W. Cox
Robert V. Anderson
Albert C. McLean
Bruce Magruder, Jr.
Robert G. Work
Lee D. Martin
Charles W. Blyth
Willard G. Orth
Samuel L. Grier
Jack A. Cohoon
Henry J. Witkowski
Paul Kessler
Weldon L. Keating
Alfred L. Lelidy
Richard M. Ulf
Gene M. McCain
Michael J. Vrabel
Alfred L. Perry, Jr.
Joseph M. Brent
Gordon S. Baxter
William L. Hewetson
Kenneth E. Rice
Richard R. Miller
Robert M. H. Dupuy
John R. Barnard
Robert E. Hill
William A. Harris
John C. Alexander
Raymond J. Elledge
Chester E. Tucker
Kenny C. Palmer
Robert J. Perrich
Stanley H. Carpenter
Gerald B. Zwetzig
Joseph R. Cross
Harold B. Wilson
Charles R. Stephen-son III
Albert J. Richter
Robert J. Laws
Gayle K. Broussard
Donald E. Gilman
Herbert J. Blaha
James F. Gallagher
William C. Patton
Stanley T. Moak
Joseph F. McPartland
John "S" McNulty, Jr.
Nye G. Rodas, Jr.
David A. Rapp
Burl B. Bevers
James A. Sloan
Robert J. Daeschler
William T. Walker

Raymond P. Coffman, Jr.
Frank T. House, Jr.
Robert H. Wilson
Robert E. Eastman
Roy J. Edwards
Arthur F. McGrail, Jr.
John B. Jones, Jr.
Robert M. Erbland
William T. Sweetman
Richard A. Savage
Faden E. Woodruff, Jr.
Robert O. Peck
Merton R. Ives
Perry T. Brixey
Paul Weller
Clifford J. Peabody
Joseph N. Eagle
Robert J. O'Shea
James A. Strickland
Austin B. Middleton, Jr.
Daniel B. Hunter
George K. Vronch
Stanley A. Myzienski
George R. Brier
Jack B. Shaffer
Harry L. Rogers, Jr.
Walter O. Day
William D. Hall
Michael M. Spark
Wayne E. Richards
Edward B. Meyer
Robert E. Parrott
Eduardo O. Coli
Jack O. Arford
Edward A. Parnell
Hermann Heinemann
Jean R. Griffith
Donald F. Swanda
William Plaskett, Jr.
Jack D. Sheldon
Ernest K. Davis
Grady L. Yoder
George W. Campbell
Daniel F. Kennedy, Jr.
Thomas N. Green
Joseph A. Schimmenti
Stewart B. McCarty, Jr.
Marion W. Morrisset
Austin S. Parker
Robert D. Savard
Donald W. Dowlearn
Ordeen M. Knight
Charles D. McMichael
"R" "J" McNeerney, Jr.
Richard W. Phifer
Robert A. Steinway
George C. Schatteman
William A. Dicus, Jr.
Patrick McGrotty
Leland E. Ziegler
Harold H. Johnson, Jr.
Joseph A. Piedmont, Jr.
William C. Carr
Irwin J. Vanderswag
Thomas M. O'Reilly
Herman W. Ashlaw
Bertram H. Curwen, Jr.
Ira P. Norfolk
Grady P. Mitchell, Jr.
Robert T. Hanifin, Jr.
Edward L. Nadeau
Walter D. Maskall
Paul Mazzuca, Jr.
James S. Hecker
Paul R. Joyce
Donald R. Segner
Robert C. Whitebread
Jack L. Reed
William J. Schreier
Chester J. Krist
Elmer H. Keshka
William J. White
Robert T. Miller

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to

the grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George S. Nelson
John M. McCarty
Gene F. Wightman
Edward E. Gibbon
John E. Curtis
Robert K. Adams
James H. Edmonson
William B. Greear, Jr.
Buford Blalock
Frederick L. Weath-erby
Carl Omasta
Robert J. Plumbly
Thomas E. Reaves
James M. Hays
William B. Sweetser
Henry H. Schroder
Arnold V. Allen
William H. Amos
Arnold W. Stogner
Joseph A. Williams
John A. Harper
William R. Myers
George T. Edwards
Ray Graham
James H. Kates
Joseph F. Barry
Richard A. Carlson
Daniel W. Merrill
James L. Hoffman
Richard C. Overby
Charles P. Johnson
George Alexander
Perry R. Fillingim
William B. Kohl
Andrew F. Marshall
Almon D. Embrey
George Cicala
John A. Scarborough
Aloysius C. Gidlewski
Harlice H. Green
Harold Sobol
Paul Carter
Beauford Griffin
Frank R. Roberson
Jose Llera
Kenneth G. Arnold
Carroll W. Horton, Jr.

Clifford J. Fields
Audra F. Ridenour
Meade H. Warthen
Lawrence W. Reed
Edward C. Needham
James M. Riley, Jr.
James C. Smith
Donald D. Amick
Walker R. Lynch
Jerry A. Harness
Arthur E. Treadwell
James "C" Elland
Novis I. Rains
Jerry K. Butler, Jr.
Warren B. Jones, Jr.
Paul V. Lloyd
Jack R. Nielsen
Maurice O. Bennette
Sargent Goen
Edward C. Schmidt
Jessie R. Collins
Charles A. Cole, Jr.
Clyde D. Therrien
Raymond E. Lewis
Glenn L. Kemp
William T. Faulk
Charles C. Jensen
James F. Sparrow
John B. Beard
William B. Edmondson
Roland D. Vary
Bill E. Parrish
Kermit R. Jensen
Thomas G. Taylor
Edward S. Norris
William J. Heacox
George "W" Graves
Samuel R. Coffey
Joseph E. Clement
John A. Wright
Claude A. Fisher
Hans DeJong
Paul F. Honeycutt
Edward O. Smith
Ewing B. Harvey
Clayton D. Sketoe
Murray G. Dowler

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Julia E. Hamblet

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Pauline B. Beckley

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jeanne Fleming
Ben A. Day
Margaret S. Ordemann
Frances A. Denbo
Kathleen J. Arney

Jeannette I. Sustad
Margaret L. Stevenson
Mary J. Fischer
Mary J. Hale

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Acting Chaplain, James P. Wesley, LL. D., offered the following prayer:

We give Thee thanks, our Father, for all who serve our Nation and especially for those who share in the work of this great legislative body. Strengthen Thou them as they bear the burdens of

the day. Grant Thy tender and gracious care to any who are sick and the comfort and peace of Thy love to those who sorrow. Watch over our loved ones by day and by night. Be Thou the companion of all who travel on errands of business for our Government. Keep and guide the representatives of our country in far-away lands. Refresh those who are on vacation. Lovingly and gratefully we praise Thee for our beloved Chaplain whose Christlike ministry in our midst brings comfort and cheer to our hearts and blessing to our Nation. Let Thy richest benediction rest upon him, upon us, and our Nation today, we pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4963) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1184) entitled "An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50-4.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 329) amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Public Law 154 (81st Cong.), making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes, is hereby amended by striking out, in section

(c) thereof, "July 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 31, 1949."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution, providing temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950. It is the second continuing resolution making appropriations for the new fiscal year and is made necessary by the failure of the other body to dispose of the appropriation bills messaged over from the House and now pending on the other side.

The House passed all the major supply bills and messaged them to the Senate prior to April 15. As of this date—considerably more than 3 months later—only eight of the appropriation bills, six of the annual supply bills and two deficiency bills, have become law.

One bill, the civil functions appropriation bill, is in conference but, on motion of the Senate conferees, further conference on it has been suspended pending action on the foreign aid and armed services appropriation bills.

Five of the bills—Interior, military, independent offices, foreign aid, and the third deficiency bill—are awaiting passage by the Senate. Of these five bills, the foreign-aid bill has been recommitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the independent offices bill is now under consideration on the floor of the Senate, the Interior and military bills have been reported and are now on the Senate calendar awaiting action on the floor. The third deficiency appropriation bill has not yet been reported by the Senate committee.

The House is marking time awaiting action on the part of the Senate and is ready to cooperate on all appropriation measures not yet disposed of.

The continuing resolution now before the House is identical with the joint resolution previously agreed to in every respect except the date. The joint resolution passed June 29, 1949, continued current appropriations to July 31, 1949. The pending joint resolution extends the date to August 31, 1949. It is to be hoped that final action can be taken on all 1950 supply bills by the middle of August or soon thereafter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman have in mind the conversation I had with him this morning about the ECA?

Mr. CANNON. May I say to the gentleman that I looked into the matter to which he refers very carefully and consulted the authorities, and am assured that this resolution takes care of foreign aid and no special mention is required in order to make it applicable or effective.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only information I have is that I was informed yesterday by the majority leader of the Senate that a Mr. Rice, if I am not mistaken, or someone over there in the Legislative Counsel's office, has given an opinion that the last continuing resolution did not cover ECA.

Mr. CANNON. We consulted Mr. Rice and he informs us that he was misunderstood. In his opinion no further lan-

guage is necessary to make it applicable to ECA funds. We also had an opinion some time ago from the General Accounting Office, which assures us that the joint resolution applies to ECA as fully as to all other affected agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, my friend states that this resolution applies to ECA appropriations and continues them the same as the other appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. I think there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention that it should so apply, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. That is entirely correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does this resolution include the \$624,000,000 additional that Great Britain is asking for ECA?

Mr. CANNON. This joint resolution includes support of all Government agencies at the rate provided for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. RICH. She is asking for \$624,000,000 additional, I noticed in yesterday morning's paper. The gentleman is not in favor of giving Great Britain \$624,000,000 to keep that socialized government going?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands that the pending resolution applies only to appropriations which have been made in former supply bills. It is a continuation of past appropriations. The gentleman realizes it has nothing to do with any future proposed appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Under ECA you have already given Great Britain over a billion dollars in the appropriation bill that passed the House.

Mr. CANNON. I have given no more than has been given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who supported the appropriations passed by the last Congress.

Mr. RICH. No, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was against it. I want the gentleman to know I am against it, and I want it in the RECORD that I am against it.

Mr. CANNON. But when these appropriation bills were passed in the last Congress the gentleman voted for them.

Mr. RICH. I am standing up here now fighting. I am against socialism and I am against keeping any government in power that is Socialist. I am against keeping any government in power that is Communist. I am for free governments of all the people all over the world. I do not want the gentleman or anybody else to say that I am trying to support the socialized Government of Great Britain, because I am against it.

Mr. CANNON. I am certain when the subjects to which the gentleman refers come before the House we shall be glad to hear the gentleman. They have nothing to do with the present resolution.

Mr. RICH. I do not want ECA to be included in this because I do not want you to appropriate money that is going to keep any government in power that is

socialistic. I would not give 1 cent to keep this country in power if it were socialistic. I would run away from it. But I hope and I am sure the American people are never going to let it go socialistic. I am going to do everything in my power to keep that from happening.

Mr. CANNON. We are always glad to hear the gentleman when he speaks on subjects before the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the House should have a picture of just what the situation is with reference to the bills to which this resolution relates.

The civil functions appropriations bill was passed by the House on the 29th day of March. It was passed by the other body on the 20th of May and went to conference on the first of June. It is still in conference. We have had many sessions, but no results.

The next bill covered is the Interior Department appropriations bill which was passed by the House on March 30. It was reported to the other body on July 13, almost 3 weeks ago, and has not yet been taken up by the other body.

The National Military Establishment appropriations bill passed the House on the 13th of April, was reported to the other body on the 22d of July, a week ago, and has not yet been taken up by the other body.

The independent offices appropriations bill, which passed the House on the 14th of April, was reported to the other body on July 8, and was taken up by the other body yesterday afternoon and is before them at the present time. When that bill will go to conference, I do not know.

The foreign aid, or ECA appropriation bill, which passed the House the 26th of May, was up before the other body and was recommitted to the Appropriations Committee of that body on yesterday.

The third deficiency appropriation bill, which passed the House on the 24th of June has not yet been reported to the Senate.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I have ever known it to be necessary to pass a second continuing resolution. I do not know how many more such resolutions we are going to have to pass. The Democratic majority is in control of both Houses of Congress and this failure to pass ordinary routine appropriation bills demonstrates the constitutional incapacity of the Democratic Party to govern.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the extensions that have been had, why not just make this extension until next January so that we can adjourn and go home and give the country a little chance?

Mr. TABER. That would interfere with the routine operations of the other body and give them so much rope that they would think they do not have to agree to a conference report.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the ECA, I see that the other body voted yesterday 41 to 37 to increase the amount for Great Britain by \$624,000,000. Then they voted to send the bill back to committee. That is going to be 42 percent of all of the ECA. Forty-two percent of all the money you are spending is for no other purpose than to keep a Socialist government going.

Mr. TABER. Well, there is another purpose. There is the purpose of keeping Great Britain bankrupt and keeping her in such condition as well as her people, that they cannot support themselves on a permanent basis.

Mr. RICH. That is a fine statement. I agree with the gentleman exactly. If it was not for America, they would have to go to work, would they not?

Mr. TABER. They would have to go to work, and that is not what they are doing.

Mr. RICH. It would be a good thing for somebody to make them go to work and earn their own way and show what socialism means to them. It means bankruptcy to any nation in my language. I am sick and tired of taxing the American people who work hard to pay Great Britain for their socialism. Socialism is a menace to any nation. Great Britain has already proven it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEAMSHIP "TAIYUAN"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1288) for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan*, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "and."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "\$3,675;" and insert "\$3,675;" and

"Vincent Foster, care of J. P. Bowman, Standard Oil Co. of California, marine department, San Francisco, Calif., the sum of \$2,310."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLYMPIC HOTEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of the Olympic Hotel, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "pay," insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL KIM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1466) for the relief of Daniel Kim, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "canceled," insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Korea for the first year that such quota is available."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE KONO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1625) for the relief of Christine Kono, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Christine Kono, the Dutch-Japanese fiancée of Charles Kramer, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Christine Kono may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Christine Kono is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Charles Kramer, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Christine Kono, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Christine Kono, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Christine Kono, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEIKO HORIKAWA AND YOSHIKO HORIKAWA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2084) for the relief of Teiko Horikawa and Yoshiko Horikawa, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Teiko and Yoshiko Horikawa, minor twin stepdaughters of David Bailey Carpenter, a World War II veteran who married Yoshi Horikawa Higo, a Japanese national and the mother of such minor stepdaughters, on August 6, 1947, and for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws Teiko and Yoshiko Horikawa shall be considered to be the natural-born daughters of their stepfather, David Bailey Carpenter."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENISE SIMEON BOUTANT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2850) for the relief of Denise Simeon Boutant, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Th Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of law which makes ineligible for permanent residence persons who are racially ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Denise Simeon Boutant, now Denise Simeon Boutant Peterson, who is the legal wife of William S. Peterson, a United States citizen, as of December 1948, at which time she was temporarily admitted into the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article showing the honor list of the dead and missing for the State of Mississippi during the recent World War.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ACTING CHAPLAIN DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the well-deserved vacation of our beloved Chaplain of the House, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, our Acting Chaplain is Dr. James P. Wesberry.

It is a great privilege to have Dr. Wesberry serve with us in the House of Representatives in the high capacity of Acting Chaplain. I feel sure that I am joined in this sentiment by every Member of the House.

Dr. Wesberry is the beloved pastor of Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta, which pastorate he has filled for the past 6 years.

At the present time Dr. Wesberry and the congregation of that church are engaged in building a new church and educational plant on a beautiful 14-acre lot in the heart of one of Atlanta's loveliest residential areas. The plant will ultimately cost approximately half a million dollars.

Dr. Wesberry is a native of South Carolina, having been born at Bishopville, S. C., April 16, 1906, the son of William McLeod Wesberry and Lillian I. Galloway. He received his education in the public schools of Columbia, S. C., and received degrees of bachelor of arts and master of arts from Mercer University, Macon, Ga. He received the degree of bachelor of divinity and master of sacred theology from Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Mass. He was a special student at Harvard University in 1931, and attended summer conferences at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. He is a graduate of the Yale School of Alcohol Studies, and was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws by the Atlanta Law School.

Dr. Wesberry was ordained as a minister of the gospel at the age of 23 on September 5, 1929, by the Park Street Baptist Church of Columbia, S. C.

He was a pastor of rural churches while a student at Mercer University, and during his last two years at that University was pastor of Soperton Baptist Church, Soperton, Ga. During that time a new church was erected at Soperton.

Dr. Wesberry also was pastor of the South Medford Baptist Church, at Medford, Mass., while a student in the seminary. His first pastorate after graduation was the Kingstree Baptist Church, Kingstree, S. C.

He served as pastor of the Bamberg Baptist Church, Bamberg, S. C., for 11 years, and since March 1, 1944, has been the pastor of Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta.

Dr. Wesberry has received special recognition for his active efforts in many

fields of endeavor. Early in life his unusual ability began to be recognized. He was student manager of athletics in the Columbia High School in 1924 and 1925. He was editor in chief of the Columbia, high school magazine. He served as assistant scoutmaster while in high school.

At Mercer University he was elected master Mercerian, the highest honor bestowed by the student body and faculty of Mercer University, receiving this honor in 1930.

He was president of the South Carolina Baptist Ministers' Conference, and chairman of the committee on order of business for the South Carolina Baptist Convention in 1943.

He was a moderator of the Barnwell Baptist Association, and since 1944, he has served in the capacity of trustee of Mercer University.

He has served as vice president of the home mission board of the Southern Baptist Convention since 1944, and is a member of its executive committee. He is a former member of the radio committee of the Southern Baptist Convention. He served in May 1949 as a member of the committee on boards and of the committee on committees, at the last meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention in Oklahoma City.

His fellow ministers in Atlanta have elected him to the position of president of the Atlanta Baptist Ministers' Conference, which position he fills at the present time.

He was vice president and chairman of the committee on order of business of the Georgia Baptist Convention in 1947.

Dr. Wesberry is recognized not only for his active efforts in church and ministerial work, but is likewise recognized for his fine civic work.

He is at present chairman of the trustees of the educational foundation of the Atlanta Lions Club. He is chairman of the trustees of the Atlanta extension of Mercer University, and professor of New Testament. He is also at present the national president of Alpha Chi Omega Divinity Fraternity.

He is a past president of the Bamberg (S. C.) Lions Club, and a past chaplain of the South Carolina State Lions convention.

During the Second World War Dr. Wesberry served as chaplain, holding the rank of captain, in the South Carolina Home Defense Guard for Bamberg County. He is chairman of the radio committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention, and is a past member of the executive committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention.

Dr. Wesberry is also known and recognized for his fine work as an author and writer. He is the author of the Life and Work of William Screven, First Southern Baptist Preacher, and is a writer of programs for the Young Peoples' Training Union Quarterly of the Southern Baptist Convention. He is a contributor of editorials, articles, and sermons to various other magazines.

It has been my privilege to know Dr. Wesberry intimately for almost the entire length of his period of service in

Atlanta. I have known him as a consecrated, sincere, and effective worker in all fields of Christian service.

His selection as Acting Chaplain of this body, I feel, brings honorable recognition to the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, where he lives and serves. I know that during his period of service here as Acting Chaplain he will endear himself to all those with whom he comes in contact, and the example of his Christian life will inspire us to apply ourselves with renewed faith and energy to the difficult tasks which we face here.

HON. MARY T. NORTON

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week while I was necessarily absent from the House briefly, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made an unfair and unwarranted attack on the motives and abilities of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. It seems that anyone who disagrees with the views of the gentleman from Mississippi, his views on human rights and decent legislation is Communist-inspired, and any organization that supports that type of legislation is a Communist-front organization. I know that virtually every Member of this House has nothing but the highest regard for my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and they know that she has served usefully and in a very splendid manner for 25 years or more in this House. Everyone I know respects her and resents this type of attack.

I sincerely hope the gentleman from Mississippi will see fit to make an apology to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include an address by the Solicitor General of the United States, notwithstanding that it may exceed the limit; and in the second to include an editorial by Mr. Frank Aiken.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extensions may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRAZIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1758) to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. And also that minority views may be filed, if there be any?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MINIMUM-WAGE BILL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as I advised the House yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has stated that he was going to call up the bill H. R. 3190, the minimum-wage bill, on August 8, under his rule. I wish to advise you again that I am going to offer as a substitute, H. R. 4272, a bill which has been prepared by a number of Members of Congress and which will be offered for your consideration. I invite each of the Members to get a copy of H. R. 4272 and study the bill so that he may understand its provisions and understand that it is a good, clean bill protecting the small businesses of the Nation. If there are any questions I shall be pleased to answer them.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CHURCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE REFUNDS TO VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for one reason or another the national service life insurance refunds have not been paid to the veterans. I took this matter up with the President and have received the following letter from him:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 27, 1949.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Replying to yours of the 22d, space in Washington is the most

unobtainable thing there is. I can't even find space enough for my own personal secretaries to transact their business.

The State Department is scattered all over town in 22 buildings, and that is true of every other department in the Government. I regret that situation but it isn't of my making—I have to take the situation as I find it and do the best I can with it.

I naturally appreciate your interest in the disbursement of the veterans insurance refunds and I am glad you are interested, for I am very much interested in it myself, and hoping that the matter can be worked out promptly.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all departments in Washington ought to be willing to give up space in order that the money due the veterans may be returned to them at once. We have heard much about the streamlining and reorganization of the Government, but we know the records show the departments are expanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. King entitled "Deficit Financing and Shrinking Dollars."

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PEACE AND HOW IT MAY BE OBTAINED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday you made the statement in the House of Representatives that we are still in a state of war. I wonder if that statement caused the President to send down here a request that we appropriate \$1,400,000,000 to arm a lot of countries that have been spoken of as the North Atlantic Pact nations. Are you going to arm those countries? What are we going to arm them for? More war? If you want war that is the way to get it. Prepare for war, arm the countries and you get war.

The way to secure peace in this world is to stop talking about war. Stop spending for war. Get that power and spirit away from the President and then let us talk peace and we will have peace in the world. That is the only way you are going to get it. Work for peace and you get peace. Prepare for war and you will get war.

Here is another thing, Mr. Speaker. We owe \$253,000,000,000 according to the Treasury statement of July 25. We have not \$1,400,000,000 to spend arming a lot of these countries in Europe. I say let us get down to the proposition of talking peace. Again I ask you where you get the \$1,400,000,000 to arm Europe. The only way to get the money is to tax our people; our people now holler, "Stop taxing us, reduce our taxes," and I am for that.

Peace be unto you.

Peace be with us for evermore—is my fervent prayer.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAYS of Arkansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

IS OUR NATION FACING MORAL DECAY?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, twice recently two outstanding figures, one the leader of a great religious faith and the other the chief of our Army, have sounded a warning of the moral decay facing our Nation and the world which should be heeded by all.

Pope Pius XII declared that morality is in retreat and called upon the women to fight against the sensuality of youth which is endangering civilization. He warned, as he has in the past, of the dangers of communism, which fastens its roots on the shattered home when parents fail in their duty to practice moral life and properly care for their offspring.

General Bradley, in his warning to the Nation asserted that the greatest single cause for delinquency in citizenship can be traced to the declining sense of responsibility in the home, the church, and the school. He said that the family is the basic unit of our society and that is where the responsibility begins.

Here we have a world church leader and a qualified military official telling us in strong words of the moral decay facing the people today. When warnings come from men of this stature, they cannot be ignored. There is a great suffering ahead for the world unless there is a moral and spiritual revival. We must halt the infection of moral decay in the homes which has spread to the youth which is walking hand-in-hand with the crass materialism of modern political philosophy. The plea of the Pope and the warning of General Bradley must not go unheeded, for if it is not heeded the forces of Marx, Stalin, and Lenin will reap the harvest.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and have printed in the RECORD General Bradley's article which appeared in the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial in each.

NO APOLOGY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was not facetious a while ago when I was asking the name of the individual who was up here attacking me. I asked all the Members around me what his name was, and none of them could tell me. I finally found out it was the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Day before yesterday the bill you passed here, of which many of you are utterly ashamed, was heralded in the Communist Daily Worker as the Marcantonio bill. I said that the other day and I say it now, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

On yesterday about the most ridiculous movement I have ever known to be made in this House was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to bury, you might say, the military housing bill, and only a few Members followed the gentleman from New York's [Mr. MARCANTONIO'S] leadership. One of those few was a man by the name of HOWELL from New Jersey. I presume it is the same gentleman who was up here attacking me a few moments ago. I have no apology for what I said in the debate on day before yesterday.

Whenever any Member attacks the people I represent, that Member may expect to hear from me in no uncertain terms.

That is what happened day before yesterday; and I have no apology for what I said.

1950 WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, the 1950 acreage allotments on wheat announced by the Secretary of Agriculture are a serious blow to the agricultural economy of the State of Montana.

The Secretary has announced that the 1950 production of wheat will be restricted to 82.9 percent of the acreage in production this year in the Nation as a whole.

This is a sizable reduction, but for the State of Montana he has announced a 1950 acreage allotment of only 76.4 percent of the 1949 figure.

This means that Montana wheat farmers, who this year have 5,579,000 acres planted in wheat, will be permitted to have only 4,265,806 acres in 1950, a decrease of 23.6 percent.

In Montana, where county and farm allotments are now being decided, there is considerable resentment against the

Secretary's decision. I think this resentment is justified.

Montana is one of the large wheat-producing States of this country. Wheat is a principal item in our agricultural economy, and agriculture is the principal item in our State economy. Such a drastic cut in wheat acreage will have a damaging effect on the entire State.

I cannot understand how the Agriculture Department arrived at this terrific reduction for my State, unless it could be that the Department has overlooked the significant fact that the lands used for raising wheat in Montana are not generally suitable for any other crop. There cannot be an easy change to another crop, as there could be in New York, Iowa, or Missouri, States which have similar reductions.

If we cannot grow wheat on our land, the land must lay idle. Montana farmers who already are suffering the effects of a serious drought in the eastern section of the State, an almost unprecedented grasshopper infestation in the southeastern section, and the general decline in prices which has occurred with particular severity in the crops in which we specialize, cannot be expected to accept without protest a Government decree which will further cut their income, especially when it appears to be unfair and all out of proportion to the importance of the matters involved.

I realize that there is little hope that the Department of Agriculture, having once spoken, will review its decision. I wish it were possible to have them do so, and I wish to be on record as protesting what appears to be an unwarranted injury to the farmers of Montana.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, before they take off for Europe it is essential that the Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders indicate to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs just what parts of our national defense program they are prepared to forego or curtail in order to make arms and equipment available to the Atlantic Pact nations.

We cannot add a billion and a half dollars, or even half that, on the already staggering figure of \$15,910,000,000 which we have appropriated for defense purposes for the next fiscal year. This record peacetime figure is already nearly 40 percent of our total budget. It must not be increased.

Our military leaders have indicated that there is a definite and urgent need for this program to implement and make effective the Atlantic Pact. That may be so. The best use of the defense dollar may be made by allotting a part of it to the arming of our friends among the western democracies. We must insist, however, that our National Defense Establishment undertake the selective

process of pointing out what part of present plans they consider less important to our national security and, therefore, worthy of elimination or deferment.

Military assistance to Europe can only be justified if it lightens the budgetary load on the United States for other items of defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times of July 26.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Stewart Alsop.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address made by Mr. Sprague, a native of Texas, before the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, and in the other the remarks made by Representative DEANE recently before the Home Rule Committee.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared recently in the Indianapolis Star.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Professor Newman.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. T. M. Medford, of Salem, Oreg.

Mr. JAMES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include various articles.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered before the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the mayor of the city of Manitowoc, Wis.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CONTINUATION OF SESSIONS OF CONGRESS BEYOND JULY 31, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House was much interested in the discussion yesterday between our distinguished former Speaker [Mr. MARTIN] and our distinguished Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN]. The Reorganization Act of 1946 provides "Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress."

Mr. MARTIN claimed that under this law Congress should adjourn before the 31st day of July. Speaker RAYBURN maintained that our country was still at war in view of the fact that peace treaties had not been signed by all the countries against whom we were fighting in the Second World War.

The language in the law is "in time of war." This does not mean in the time while peace negotiations were being carried on. Furthermore it is very probable that we will never enter into a peace treaty with Germany. If the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is sustained we will always be at war with Germany.

The Speaker's ruling may bring serious consequences because the constitutionality of any law passed in this session of Congress after July 31 might be questioned in court. The claim would be that Congress was not legally in session.

There is a way out of this dilemma. Congress should immediately pass a concurrent resolution to cover this situation.

On yesterday I introduced such a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, August 20, 1949, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

This or some similar resolution should and could be passed immediately.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is absolutely right. If we are in a state of war and we have to stay here all summer and fall, let us appropriate the money for the defenses of this country. We have to fight the wars anyway. We fought the last one with our money, and the first one. As I remember the history of the war, it was the Americans that landed in Africa, in Italy, in France, and in the Pacific Islands. So let us look out for ourselves here instead of trying to carry on the battle of everybody else. As the gentleman pointed out, we owe \$252,000,000,000. If we are going to go in debt again, let us do it for the United States.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent suggestion by Budget Director Frank Pace that a simplified budget summary be issued next January is commendable. The idea is to boil down the 1,400-page budget into a 30-page summary and in such simple terms that the average citizen will be able to understand it.

Director Pace also suggests that President Truman make a major address on the budget later this summer. With a deficit of \$1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and a possible deficit of \$5,000,000,000 plus for the next year, the President will have much to talk about.

But it occurs to me that we should have something more than talk. And commendable though reducing the physical budget to 30 pages may be, I believe the average citizen, who might thereby be able to understand it, would be much, much more interested in seeing a boiling down of the actual figures of the budget. Except for the brief period of 1947-48 the Federal Government is still engaged in deficit financing. When and where is this spending going to stop? The average citizen wants to know—judging from the mail which his Congressman receives. He wants his Government to begin practicing some economy. He wants the Hoover Commission recommendations put into effect. And he wants some tax relief.

Yet what do we find? In a single month in 1949 our Government spends as much as the \$3,500,000,000 total cost of 4 years of the Civil War.

In the last four peacetime years, 1946-49, the Federal spending was \$177,000,000,000. This exceeds the \$167,000,000,000 spent during the entire 152 years following George Washington's inauguration as President of the United States. Just think of it. Is it any wonder that the average citizen is more interested in boiling down the budget figures than in reducing the size of the book which contains them?

I am quite certain he is not going to be satisfied with talk about the budget—by the President or anyone else. He wants some action and that right soon.

ARMY WASTE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Oneonta Star paper of New York of Friday, July 8, 1939, and I read:

This is an inspection by the Chief of Army Engineers.

The inspection group arriving at Keyes Airport in the general's DC-3 Army transport

was met by three Government cars sent from Baltimore, Md., to transport the party to the dam.

That is 350 miles. It probably would cost to send those cars up, including the per diem of the chauffeurs and the mileage and the maintenance and all that sort of thing, from \$400 to \$500.

In brackets in the article is this statement:

[An Oneonta taxi firm estimated that the party, which required three cars, and took 1 hour and 45 minutes, could have been provided local transportation at a cost of slightly more than \$10.]

Mr. Speaker, this is a sample of the way the bureaucrats are wasting the money of the people of the United States.

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words of praise about the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL]. Our colleague, who is in his first term here, is making an outstanding record for himself. He is very faithful in attendance on the floor of the House and with his committee meetings. He takes part in all the functions of the House of Representatives. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was sincere in saying he did not know who the gentleman from New Jersey was, he must be one of the very few Members of Congress who does not know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I demand those words be taken down. A man cannot stand on the floor of the House and accuse another of insincerity.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was sincere in saying he did not know who he was, he must be one of the very few Members of Congress who does not know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order. That does not violate the rules. I thought he said I was insincere.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] just said that if he had voted yesterday he would have voted with Mr. MARCANTONIO on that radical motion to bury the military housing bill.

So that settles the matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the point of order is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain editorials and printed matter.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Sabine-Neches waterway

project, and also in another instance and include certain extraneous matter.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I may ask the majority leader with reference to the program for next week and the balance of this week, if he is prepared to tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to announce the program as far as I am able to.

Monday, of course, is Consent Calendar day. There are 11 bills to be considered under suspension of the rules. An important one, H. R. 5598, a pension increase of service-connected disability cases. I have agreed with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that if there is to be a roll call on that bill, I will try to have it put over until Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon termination of the debate on the bill H. R. 5598 on Monday next that final action be taken on the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. That is perfectly agreeable, Mr. Speaker. The bill will be taken up under suspension, and if there is a roll call, which undoubtedly there will be, it will be put over until Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I wish to make the same request with reference to the conference report on the unification bill. In the event the conference report is submitted with reference to the unification bill, if it is called up on Monday and there is a roll call, that the vote will be taken on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I may state to the House that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], told me that the conferees have agreed on the unification bill for the armed services. Of course, the Senate must act first. As we are going to adjourn tonight until Monday, that would come up on Monday. I would suggest to the gentleman that in the event of a roll call final action on that matter be taken on Tuesday.

I ask unanimous consent now, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a roll call on the adoption of the conference report on the unification bill, and I assume there will be, because the amendments of the Senate are far-reaching and important and the Members of the House may want to go on record, that the final action be taken on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to make a suggestion. If we do not finish these bills that are on the calendar to be considered under suspension on Monday, they will all have to go over for 2 weeks. I was wondering

if it would not be better to say that in all probability, unless we get through with those 11 suspensions on Monday, the conference report would not come up until Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called, and 11 bills will be called up under suspension of the rules, the one of very substantial importance being H. R. 1558, to provide a pension increase in service-connected cases.

We hope to adjourn today over to Monday.

The SPEAKER. I think it would probably save some time if the Chair's suggestion were followed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me to call up the conference report on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The bills to be called up under suspension are:

H. R. 4446, the Administrative Practitioners Act.

S. 1076, Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act.

H. R. 1746, restoration and management, fisheries projects.

H. R. 5535, Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

H. R. 5730, Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

H. R. 4403, recreational facilities.

H. R. 3282, Indians—liquor law.

H. R. 4548, Fort Logan, Colo., National Cemetery.

H. R. 3788, Vermejo reclamation project.

H. R. 163, construction of canals in Sacramento Valley.

Following that we will take up H. R. 29 under a rule. If taken up on Monday but not concluded, its consideration will be continued on Tuesday; if not reached on Monday it will be the first order of business on Tuesday, following the Private Calendar.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday.

For the balance of the week other bills will be considered if rules are reported on them. I may say that the House has been far ahead of the Rules Committee. However, if rules are reported, the following bills will be called up for consideration:

H. R. 5472, public works, rivers and harbors bill.

H. R. 5330, Korean aid.

H. R. 1758, Natural Gas Act amended.

H. R. 5738, amends Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—cotton acreage.

Conference reports may be called up at any time.

That program depends on what the House may receive through the generosity of the Rules Committee; all of them are dependent upon whether or not rules are reported. There are certain things we would like to dispose of and the quicker we can do so the quicker the House can get through and be in position to take 3-day recesses. I make this statement in all frankness to the House, that I am looking forward to being in a position, if certain bills are disposed of, if the Committee on Rules makes their consideration in order, when we can take 3-day recesses. We have

a rivers and harbors bill, the consideration of which is waiting on the pleasure of the Committee on Rules. As a matter of fact appropriations have already been made, some of which are dependent on authorizations contained in that bill. The bills have been reported. It is to be hoped that the Rules Committee will cooperate so the House can express its will, that is all. Let the House do the expressing of its will. Then we are in a very good position to take some 3-day recesses in the not-too-remote future.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. In the matter of the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that votes go over until a later date, I want to refer to what happened on Monday last when certain matters came in here upon which some of us wanted to have a record vote, but we were advised that some agreement had been entered into preventing that. I do not propose to let that happen any more. I think we ought to get along with the business of the House and expedite it in every way possible.

The SPEAKER. That is one of the reasons for the consideration of these bills under suspensions.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are only trying to expedite the business of the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he will inform the House, if he can, what procedure will be followed on August 8 when we have two privileged bills due to come up for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter for the Speaker and the majority leader would not venture an opinion. I may say that I would never invade the jurisdiction of anyone, particularly our beloved Speaker. The question of who will be recognized is a matter of recognition for the Speaker to determine. I am sure if the gentleman will confer at the right time with the Speaker—and this is 2 weeks off—knowing the Speaker as I do and knowing him as the gentleman does, he will probably receive adequate information. I shall not attempt to answer the inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object at this time, but I want to serve notice that hereafter for the balance of this session I shall object to the long week-end recesses of the House until we have completed our business for this session. As long as we have to sit here and sweat it out during the heat of a Washington midsummer we should devote our time to the business of the House, so that we may adjourn at the earliest opportunity. I say this in all kindness: It

seems that the policy of conducting the business of this House throughout the past several years has been for the benefit of the Members of the House who live along the Atlantic seacoast so they can join their families over the long week ends and attend to their business affairs. Those of us who live out in the Midwest and the far West scarcely ever get home during sessions of the Congress and I think some consideration should be given those of us who come from that part of the country. So, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the present request, but I do want to serve notice that the gentleman from Iowa for one is going to object to such requests during the remainder of the session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that any thing he says does not disturb me in the least, but in justice to the Members of the House may I say that the leadership on both sides of the House have been very cooperative. The reason for these week-end adjournments is not for the convenience of any particular Members who live in particular areas nearby. That is purely an incidental matter and I think the House should know that. However, when the House has performed a real week's work I have always felt that we can go over from Thursday to Monday to enable the Members to do their office work, for instance. All of us are busy. We are not loafing and when the Members get a real week's work in I have felt that the membership of the House deserves the recess.

Also, may I say that when we have adjourned from Thursday to Monday it has always been because we have had no business to transact; otherwise the House would have met on Friday, and then adjourned until Monday. I agree with the basic purpose of the gentleman's objection, but I think that explanation should be made to show that we always sit on Friday when there is business to be transacted. Of course, nobody objects to adjourning from Friday to Monday. The only time we have gone over from Thursday to Monday is when we have not had any business to transact. We will dispose of a bill that will come up shortly and there is no other rule that we can call up today or tomorrow, so that if we did meet tomorrow we would simply meet and adjourn. That is why I made the statement that I hope the Rules Committee will be generous and I think the significance of my remarks was caught by every Member present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I was on my feet to join in this move when the gentleman from Iowa rose back there. What the majority leader says about working in your office is all right, but over the years I have noticed that when we got along to the last of the session—and sometimes we used to stay here until 10 or 11 o'clock at night—the legislation was not given very much consideration. Instead of being in the offices, I noticed that some of these Members—

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was talking about a Democratically con-

trolled House when he said that they worked late?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, in 1937, 1940, and along in there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, all right; we will not go into that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will not quarrel with the gentleman. I think what these gentlemen from the west coast, and even some up in Maine and out in Michigan, are objecting to, is that so many of these gentlemen from New York and around here, dig out Thursday and go home and engage in business, and they come back on Tuesday. I know what I am talking about, and we do not like it any more.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that I have no business for tomorrow; therefore I asked that we go over until Monday. We have not wasted a Monday. I put bills on for Monday that we have to take up, which run over to Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. They are bills on which there is not much controversy, so why not put them on and clean them up?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is my point. Why not bring them in here and get them out of the way?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will help me with the Committee on Rules we will get them out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had not quite finished. May I have 1 second more, or 2? When the gentleman from Massachusetts was talking about the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, was sitting right there by him and I heard him say—I am not so far away—I heard him say that he was waiting for the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. He was what?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard him say that he was waiting for the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you see, the gentleman did not hear correctly what he said.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, I did. The gentleman was talking and I was listening.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was talking about a particular bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I make this reservation for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader why, in the enumeration of the bills that are now before the Committee on Rules on which action is hoped for, he did not mention the National Science Foundation bill. Was there a reason for eliminating that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, we have been trying to get that out just as vigorously as we could and as we can. We are very anxious to get that rule out.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am pleased to hear that. That is in line with what the gentleman said with reference to the other bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I said was not meant to exclude other bills, but I

just simply referred to some as an illustration.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am very glad to hear that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EIGHTY-THIRD AND FINAL NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 102 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee which shall be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall represent the Congress at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., from August 28 to September 1, 1949.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the honor of calling up this resolution. There was a time when it would have been most unusual for a member of my State to handle a resolution concerning an encampment of Union soldiers. Time has erased all ill feeling and we now have in our hearts only respect for the great Americans who fought on both sides of the Civil War.

One of Texas' great Senators, the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, likes to tell the story of a southern boy who came home after the war and was chided about having said the South could whip the Yankees with cornstalks. "Well," he said, "I did tell you that and it's true. But you know, they wouldn't fight with cornstalks."

Inevitable as it is, Mr. Speaker, we regret the passing of all but a few of the grand old men. They will have seen their eighty-third and final national en-

campment. This Congress could do no less in honor of these great Americans than to send representatives to this final encampment.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the honor of handling this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have no request for time at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LYLE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], the author of the resolution.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of this resolution. First, I want to endorse wholeheartedly the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Texas. We are all happy that the bitterness that existed at the close of the War Between the States is now a thing almost past. I have the same feeling toward those old soldiers who wore the gray as I do for those who wore the blue uniform in that war.

This final encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic is being held in my district, in the city of Indianapolis, where the first encampment was held 84 years ago. As the gentleman from Texas said, it is a fitting tribute to those few who tarry on this side of the river, in the late evening of their lives before they join the larger encampment of their comrades on the other side, that we send representatives of the Congress of this great Union to this, their final encampment in this world. There are but a few of them left, I think 29. There probably will be only six or eight who will be able to attend this encampment. As a greeting and a final tribute to those who fought in the war to preserve the Union I ask that you approve this resolution. Thank you.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to be the namesake and grandson of a Confederate veteran. In view of that fact, it may seem odd to some of you that I rise in support of the resolution now before the House for consideration. I think the resolution is a grand gesture and furthermore that it is indicative of an attitude nurtured by many of us who during the last three quarters of a century have realized and enjoyed the benefits guaranteed to us as a result of the War Between the States.

Many people do not appreciate the real purpose and influencing motive of that war. Many people do not appreciate the courage and valor with which the Confederate soldiers fought. He was willing to sacrifice his life to save a principle of government in which he believed; a principle of States' rights without unnecessary Federal intervention. Many people do not appreciate that those poor soldiers returned to their homes only to find them in shambles and ruined. They had nothing, they were penniless. Their currency was more worthless than a Chinese yen is today. However, they met their fate with a determined vigor

and through the past 75 years the South has prospered to a degree that it is now the most outstanding section of our country. Such prosperity and progress is demonstrative of good citizenship and sound political philosophy.

Most of us regret that there was bloodshed, but we should all be proud that the most unfortunate war in the history of our country solidified our United States and gave rebirth to a philosophy of government that has promoted our youthful Nation to the pinnacle of honor and freedom for all men throughout the world.

Most people do not realize that the gallant soldiers of our Confederacy have never been permitted to enjoy the benefits of hospitalization, pensions, and so forth, that have been afforded the veterans of all the other wars of our country. Yet they did as much to give you and me a free country as did any of the veterans of the other war.

It is a late date, but not too late for our great Government to express its appreciation to those fine gentlemen for their part in uniting our States. Consequently, I intend to introduce within the next few days a bill that will afford them a pension or cash benefits during the remainder of their lives. There are only a few. Their honor is great, and they may not desire to receive it at this time. However, I think it is only proper that our Government offer it.

I do not know whether the Confederate veterans will hold another reunion. I hope they do, because I want to attend as a member of a delegation from this Congress. To the members of the Grand Army of the Republic on their reunion, I offer my sincere best wishes and many happy returns of the day.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I have the honor of being descended from both Confederate and Union soldiers. I am proud of it, and I endorse what the gentleman says in reference to our unity 100 percent.

Mr. HARE. That is very generous of the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. I think at this time it would be apropos to place in the RECORD the statement that the gentleman represents a county which contributed seven major generals to the Confederacy. Is that not true?

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPERIMENTAL SUBMARINES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 300, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 4007. This is a bill to amend the act of May 16, 1947, which authorized an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for the construction of two submarines.

The bill before us increases that appropriation by \$11,000,000. This notwithstanding that the Navy engineers and experts all testified that the cost of construction of these two experimental submarines would not be more than \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 each, or a total of \$25,000,000.

Personally, I was under the impression that the Navy had sufficient unexpended funds that could easily be used for the additional cost that they claim these two submarines would cost. I could not understand why it is that after 2 years, when material costs have been reduced, it is necessary to spend \$11,000,000 additional on these two submarines.

Is it possible that they have some new gadgets to install in these submarines. I feel that the men assigned to the hazardous duty in these vessels should have all comforts and safeguards provided for them, and they are entitled to them in order to insure adequate protection of both life and limb, but I do not feel the submarines should be equipped with the most expensive fittings. Of course, the Navy gentlemen claim there are new devices that they desire to use for the completion of the submarines.

I am not going to set myself above the experts in the Navy Department. In view of the fact that the chairman of the committee and especially the chairman of the subcommittee and these Navy gentlemen felt that favorable consideration should be given to this bill for an increase of \$11,000,000, we reported the rule.

But once more I want to call attention to the fact that not only the Committee on Armed Services but other committees should be more careful in reporting bills that call for additional millions of dollars of appropriations. The country is commencing to complain, and my Republican friends, who criticize so continuously that we appropriate large sums

of money and are spending more money than we should, are the very ones who advocate, urge, and vote for all these appropriations, and additional expenditures.

However, I feel that the rule should be adopted. I feel that the bill will be passed. Of course, when it comes to spending money I know nearly all of the Republicans will vote for it.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am in honor bound to answer some statements that have been made by our extremely efficient, capable, sincere, honest, and hard-working majority leader, who kindly criticizes the Rules Committee for inaction and says that the House is way ahead of the Rules Committee. If the House is ahead on account of the failure of the Rules Committee to report some of the bills, so is the country. Had we reported all the bills that have been recommended by some of the committees, an additional five or six billion dollars would have been appropriated, and in most instances I think unnecessarily. I do not only advocate economy, but I am trying to practice it.

Of course, the Committee on Rules, as constituted, is not in accord on all matters. Each and every member of that committee has his own ideas, beliefs, and viewpoints, and rightly so. Unfortunately, we cannot always agree on all fours in reporting rules. Had the leadership given me one or two additional progressive members for my committee, my task would be easier and more co-operative action could be obtained. If such were the case we could have reported more of the bills that are pending and which the President and the administration desires.

I hope I will be able to report rules on some of the pending requests before the Committee on Rules sometime next week. Some of the pending requests for rules are: the Korea-aid bill—we have held several hearings on this measure. It is a bill that involves \$150,000,000 and there are many outstanding Members who feel it is not justifiable to spend this money at the present time.

The National Science Foundation bill is pending in committee. I know that the President and others are desirous of obtaining a rule thereon and I am trying my best to comply with their requests, but I do not have the votes and I cannot club the membership into voting out a rule when they feel they want more time to study and consider same.

Unfortunately, some gentlemen who were especially interested in the rivers and harbors bill insisted that a vote be taken on the granting of a rule notwithstanding that the hearings on this bill were not completed. Consequently, by a majority vote of the Committee on Rules, the motion to grant a rule was defeated. As long as I am a member of the Rules Committee and its chairman, I shall not deny any Member of the House his right to be heard, whether it be in favor of or in opposition to any bill. That was my position yesterday, that was my position the day before yesterday, and it shall continue to be my position. I am not

going to deny any Member the right to be heard before the Committee on Rules even if it takes a day or two longer. Sometimes I am obliged to call two or three meetings in 1 day.

We also have the reforestation bill which calls for the expenditure of perhaps a million dollars plus. That has been delayed. There is a liquidation trust bill and a rehabilitation bill which we should act on favorably because it means \$46,000,000 for the Treasury of the United States.

Then there is the Engle mining bill which will cost perhaps three to four hundred million dollars. Personally, I feel that some bill to relieve these small independent miners in the West should receive consideration because the money appropriated will eventually come back to the Treasury of the United States and it would also result in our obtaining strategic materials such as copper, zinc, lead, and also one or two other important minerals that we are obliged to import at higher prices than we could obtain them if these small mines were permitted to operate. If these mines do not obtain some aid from the Government, they will be obliged to close and by closing they will be ruined because the water will seep in and it will cause a tremendous loss to the small-mine owners, as well as to the country at large.

Then we have a very important bill involving the State of California, which would permit the harnessing of the waters of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers. This will make available for farming 300,000 or 400,000 acres of land for the production of additional crops and at the same time it will save that section of the country from the danger of a shortage of water.

I am extremely desirous that the Committee on Ways and Means bring in the bill to amend the Social Security Act, and, of course, I know that many Members are anxiously waiting to vote for the minimum-wage bill. However, with respect to that bill, in view that a discharge resolution has been introduced and is in order, the bill is scheduled to be considered by the House on Monday, August 8. This consideration has been made possible under the rule which I introduced and which passed the House early in the session, providing that if the Committee on Rules did not act on a request for a hearing within 21 calendar days, the chairman of the committee reporting the bill would be privileged to call the bill up for consideration after the expiration of 21 days. However notwithstanding the statement of the majority leader who has inferred that we are delaying the House in legislating, I wish to say in justice to the Committee on Rules that it has reported this session, 82 rules making in order the consideration of various bills and 6 resolutions giving investigatory and subpoena power to legislative committees of the House. This is a greater number of rules than has been reported by any previous Committee on Rules in any one session of the House.

Consequently, I feel that the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts is not exactly justifiable, although I know that he has the best interest of the membership at heart, notwithstanding what some of the gentlemen on the other side may say. He does desire that the House should as speedily as possible complete its business so that we may take recesses for 3 days at a time and at the same time that our action may encourage the other body also to go to work instead of filibustering on important measures, that it may get busy and complete the legislative programs so that the Congress can adjourn as speedily as possible.

Personally, as to adjournments over Fridays or over week ends, let me say that there may be a few Members from the East or nearby district who desire to go home, but these are Members who are not afraid to go home. They go home and meet the people and find out the viewpoint of the people and learn what the people desire. That is the reason they go home, and at the same time, perhaps, to enjoy a little cooler weather than we are experiencing here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry indeed that my very dear friend from Illinois manifests such a sensitive disposition. He knows, of course, the fond affection I have for him, and my remarks were not directed toward him. But then, again, his loyalty to the Committee on Rules comes to the surface. So we grant the gentleman our complete blessing and absolution for the defense. The fact remains, however, I may say to my dear friend, that we have no business for tomorrow. The fact remains that I had to put many bills on the calendar of suspensions for Monday. To most of them there is no objection except that in some instances they go beyond the \$1,000,000 rule. But I am doing so merely to try to get some action. I could have used Monday for other purposes. For instance, we could have begun consideration of the rivers and harbors bill, or the cotton quota bill, Korea bill, or some of these other bills. These bills should be brought to the floor of the House that the House may express its will upon them.

There are three or four important bills that must come up. A lot of others can go over until next year. I think we should get through with these important bills. Then we can commence a series of 3-day recesses and it might, as the gentleman said, inspire quick action elsewhere to bring about an early adjournment. All that I have in mind is the best interest of every Member of the House and of the other body, as a matter of fact, in trying to speed up this work. As far as I am concerned, I could stay here all year, but I recognize that the Members have worked hard and are entitled to a vacation. I apologize to nobody in stating that we are entitled to a vacation, but there is certain legislation that must be considered. So the gentle-

man cannot answer the fact that we have no business. There is only one rule out of the Rules Committee outside of the one we are now considering and that is the one relating to parity prices on tung oil and honey. That will come up for consideration on Monday or Tuesday. I put that off so that we would have some sort of a program next week and in the hope the committee will report out some bills so that we can bring up real business.

Mr. SABATH. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not feel that I need any defense, for if he would search his heart I am certain the gentleman would conclude that there is no man here more desirous of expediting the business of the House than I. This is the underlying reason for the creation and the existence of the Committee on Rules. Besides expediting legislation we withhold consideration of ill-advised and unnecessarily expensive legislation and appropriations.

Personally, I do not feel that I need any defense for my own actions, for as I said before, if I had a majority on the Rules Committee which is the policy committee of the House, I could have reported without any unnecessary delay, rules on legislation in which the President and the administration is interested.

Notwithstanding the friendly admonition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, and other gentleman from time to time, to the effect that the Rules Committee is not a legislative committee and is usurping a power not theirs, I wish to state were it not for the fact that we have some lopsided committees who report bills in the interest of and affecting the local economy of their own districts, States, or section and upon which they request rules for consideration, the Committee on Rules would not be obliged to withhold action on those bills which their committees report which are in the interest of the entire country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall, of course, that I had the great privilege of serving on the Committee on Rules. I have watched the operation of the Committee on Rules, and I would just like to say to the gentleman that from my standpoint I would not be too apologetic about the fact that every now and then the Committee on Rules does not report out rules on some of the bills that are brought there. I think that by reason of its action in that regard through the years the Committee on Rules has served the best interests of the Congress and the country.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; it was my pleasure to have served with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on the committee of which I am chairman, and I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] states that he is here continuously. So am I. As a matter of fact, I have not been away for a single

day and with the exception of one evening, I work nearly every evening, many times until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, going over bills and resolutions and reports so that I could inform the House from time to time of their contents. Nearly all of the Members are extremely busy. It is not like when I came to this House when we did not have anywhere near the amount of work that we have now. Realizing that fact, I am trying to be of service to the membership of the House, to both sides, obtaining and giving information that I can impart to the membership, preparing reports and arranging for the scheduling of hearings to the best of my ability. So, I am doing all I can. Unfortunately, my committee is so constituted, as I said before, that I cannot always get the votes for the bills that the administration desires or that some committee has reported.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made. I want to compliment the gentleman because I believe he is forthright; I believe he is saying what the people back home are demanding. I think he has shown excellent judgment. He has pointed out in one case an attempt to save \$150,000,000. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his forthrightness and his courage in this respect.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Now, let me say this to the majority leader and to the Members present, that there are different ways to bring up bills outside of going to the Committee on Rules. We have the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, we have suspension day, and above all we have Calendar Wednesday. When I came to the House 43 years ago Calendar Wednesday was the only day that a committee could bring up bills, whether the Speaker liked it or not. At that time Uncle Joe Cannon, who had the reputation of being the "czar of the House" and whom I respected for his great ability, though he was a Republican, from my personal observation I was satisfied he had perfect vision in the evenings, but who, during the day when the House was in session could only see out of his left eye—the Republican eye; he could never see the Democratic side, and no one could be recognized therefrom. But under the Calendar Wednesday rule which he tried to abolish but which we finally succeeded in saving, we have safeguarded the Member's interests and if we did not get unanimous consent, either then or today, every Wednesday the bills that were on the calendar that were not reported by the then reckless, indifferent, and useless Rules Committee, could be called up on Calendar Wednesday. As a matter of interest, the Rules Committee in those days was composed of three members and was dominated and controlled by Uncle Joe Cannon, who was its chairman and Speaker of the House.

In view of the statement made, I do not feel that I should be placed in the position that I, as chairman of the committee, have not done my duty. I want

to assure you that I have done everything in my power to help the House to continue to expedite legislation, as I said before, and that has always been my position, and that the Committee on Rules should aid in every way to help bring about early consideration of legislation that the country demands and is entitled to.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. May I say to the gentleman, who is a Member of long standing and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that I commend the good work of that committee and its chairman for its discernment and protection of the people and the Congress from hasty and ill-considered legislation in its handling of the matters that have come before it.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman, who was one of the Members who desired to present important evidence on the rivers and harbors and flood-control bill. I think the majority of the Members feel that I have tried to do my duty.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I, too, want to compliment the gentleman on his fine work as chairman of the Committee on Rules. May I point out that the gentleman does not exercise dictatorial control over the Committee on Rules on either side of the aisle, and that there have been differences of opinion on the Democratic side, when certain members of the Committee on Rules teamed up with the Republicans to withhold certain legislation from the floor. I see no reason for this great alarm because there has been, shall we say, a switch of tactics and the other group at this time sees fit to vote with our good friends the Republicans. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. I know the gentleman has no control over this situation, and I certainly do not think he should be criticized for it.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. Of course I cannot blame some of the members on the other side, because frequently they come to my rescue and my aid, which I frequently need, and for which I am thankful. I want to express my appreciation for their cooperation from time to time, but I would hope that they would cooperate with me more frequently than they have. Of course, they have their own views, their own ideas, their own beliefs. I have tried for years to change their views to make them feel that the Democratic principles and policies are the best for the Nation, but I have not been able to convince them all. I hope I will be able to convince a few more in the near future.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely do not want to get in between on the gentleman's controversy, but I just want

the RECORD to show that in my tenure here the gentleman from Illinois has been one of the most fair-minded men in the House. I never have presented anything to his committee but what he has given me every cooperation.

I know the gentleman is familiar with the greatest playground of America, northern Wisconsin, and I know he would like to come up into northern Wisconsin and spend a few days there.

Mr. SABATH. I would be only too pleased to go to that land of milk and honey. They have plenty of milk there, in which the gentleman has always been interested, and, of course, others have some honey, so I can call it the land of milk and honey. Some people say "business before pleasure," but my duties here come before the pleasure of availing myself of the gentleman's invitation. I am therefore obliged to deny myself this privilege and pleasure of visiting the great State of Wisconsin, which borders on the great State of Illinois, but I shall do so sometime because I know the people of Wisconsin are good people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that after Michigan is considered his State comes first.

I also wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I have been before his committee many times in the last 17 years, and have always observed that every Member is treated with uniform kindness and consideration.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from Michigan and others who have spoken so kindly of me and I wish to say further, that in my experience, the Members of the Rules Committee from the State of Michigan have always been extremely fair, straightforward and conscientious men, namely the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the gentleman who preceded him, Mr. Carl Mapes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I appreciate sincerely all the remarks made here today and I hope that I shall continue to maintain the confidence of you gentlemen as well as that of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment our young chairman of the Committee on Rules for the excellent work he has done in that capacity. He is unquestionably one of the hardest working and one of the most faithful Members of the House. Inasmuch as he has explained this resolution so thoroughly, I do not think we have to go into it any further.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BONNER]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is now weighing his choice to fill the vacancy which exists on the Supreme Court. The judiciary branch of the Government has traditionally been considered to be beyond the realm of politics. Until the advent of the New Deal, Republican and Democratic Presidents alike had made a conscientious effort to maintain a political balance in their appointments to the Federal judiciary which would insure proper representation of all political views. I must, however, take note that since 1933 the trend has been toward placing the Federal judiciary on a spoils basis, a trend which has been deplored not only by the legal experts, students of jurisprudence, and lawyers, but by thinking people everywhere. Presidents Roosevelt and Truman during their tenure have named 10 men to the Supreme Court; 9 of those 10 have been Democrats. President Truman provided the single exception when he named Justice Burton, a Republican. Of the last 189 Federal judgeships, 182 of them have been Democrats, only 7 were Republicans. The Senate in its wisdom and in its response to the overwhelming demand by the American people, may have killed President Roosevelt's ill-famed court-packing bill in 1937, nevertheless the Federal courts have been packed steadily during the last 17 years, with the result that as of today the Federal judiciary is top-heavy with Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to this House, and I will insert a table in the RECORD supporting my figures, that at no time in this century was the Court as unbalanced in favor of one political party as it is today. From 1900 until 1909, there were seven Republicans and two Democrats on the Supreme Court, from 1910 to 1916, six Republicans and three Democrats; from 1917 to 1921, five Republicans and four Democrats; from 1922 to 1932, six Republicans and three Democrats; from 1933 to 1937, five Republicans and four Democrats; in 1938, four Republicans and five Democrats; in 1939 to 1940, three Republicans and six Democrats; from 1941 to 1946, two Republicans and seven Democrats; and for the past 3 years, one Republican and eight Democrats. Thus, it can be seen that the historic proximate 6 to 3 ratio has been discarded by the last two occupants of the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge upon President Truman, in the interests of maintaining the integrity of our basic institutions, and preserving proper political representation on them, that he name an outstanding Republican jurist to the Supreme Court vacancy which now exists. To do less, would be an admission that the highest Court of the land is being turned into a political instrument in violation of all fundamental principles of our great Republic and against the fundamental philosophy of equal justice for all.

Justices of the Supreme Court 1900-49

Year	Chief Justice	Associate Justices								
1900	Melville W. Fuller (D).	David J. Brewer (R).	Henry B. Brown (R).	George Shiras, Jr. (R).	Horace Gray (R).	John M. Harlan (R).	Rufus W. Peckham (R).	Joseph McKenna (R).	Edward D. White (D).	
1901	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1902	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1903	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1904	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	7R
1905	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	2D
1906	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1907	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1908	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1909	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1910	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1911	Ed. White (D).	Chas. Hughes (R).	Willis Van Devanter (R). ¹	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1912	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1913	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	6R
1914	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	3D
1915	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1916	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1917	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1918	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	5R
1919	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	4D
1920	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1921	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1922	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1923	William H. Taft (R).	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1924	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1925	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1926	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1927	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	6R
1928	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	3D
1929	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1930	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1931	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1932	Charles Hughes (R).	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1933	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1934	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	5R
1935	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	4D
1936	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1937	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1938	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1939	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	4R
1940	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	5D
1941	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	3R
1942	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	6D
1943	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1944	Harlan Stone (R).	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1945	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	2R
1946	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	7D
1947	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	
1948	Fred Vinson (D).	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	8D
1949	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	do.	1R

Addenda: In the following cases (as indicated by reference figures) there was a vacancy on the Court as of Jan. 1. Therefore, the Justice (or Justices) appointed after Jan. 1 was (were) named. These men were appointed on the dates noted below: ¹ Jan. 3. ² Mar. 18. ³ Jan. 2. ⁴ Feb. 5. ⁵ Feb. 15.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4007, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an extremely important measure. It is not complicated. The facts are rather simple and very understandable, and I think it is an extremely important bill.

In 1946 this Congress passed an authorization bill under the terms of which we authorized the construction of 4,000 tons of submarines at a cost not to exceed \$30,000,000. The Navy came back to our committee about 2 months ago and indicated that the \$30,000,000 authorized for the construction of these two submarines would not be sufficient for that purpose and asked that the ceiling be

taken off of the amount of authorization so that the submarines could proceed to construction. The committee decided not to take the limit off but to change the limit from \$30,000,000 to \$41,000,000 as the maximum amount to be authorized for the construction of these two experimental submarines.

The reason for the change was twofold. According to the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, the increased cost is due to labor and material, and to the improvement in design. Those two features are the reasons for the increased cost.

The Navy had no adequate basis on which to figure the cost of the submarines, other than the basis of what it cost to do this work in 1944 and 1945. That was the period when we did some submarine construction and we knew what it would cost. So when these two

experimental-type submarines, called prototype submarines, were considered, the estimate of cost was set on the basis of what it had cost in 1944 and 1945. That estimate would have given a cost of twelve or thirteen million dollars per submarine, and that would figure approximately twenty-four or twenty-five million dollars. The committee originally set a maximum of \$30,000,000 as being the ultimate cost of the two submarines.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. REES. Does that mean that the cost of \$30,000,000 in 1945 and 1946 has increased to \$41,000,000 for the same general type of ship?

Mr. BROOKS. No. It was due to two factors: The increased cost of labor and materials, and improvement in the design of the submarine since that time. I will go into that in detail.

Since the end of the war we have come into possession of the secrets which were used by the Germans in the course of their submarine construction. We all know that Germany reached a high point in submarine construction. We now have available the secrets which they used in their submarine design and construction. In addition to that, our own laboratories have shown improvement in equipment and submarine design.

It is the purpose of this bill to permit the construction of experimental types of submarines of the most modern design. As a result of it, the hull has to be changed; the type of equipment placed in the submarine is improved, the idea being improvement for increased depth and increased speeds of the submarines.

All of those things together indicate clearly that there is an increased cost in the building of this type of submarine.

Now you say, why could that not have been anticipated? The reason is this, that these are submarines of experimental type. If they were standard types of ships, you might estimate the cost fairly accurately, but when you are building something which is experimental in nature, it is almost impossible to estimate the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. COX. As I recall, at the hearing yesterday one of the experts before the Committee on Rules on the gentleman's application for a rule made the statement that the engines used in the present-day experimental submarines cost 300 percent more than the engines that were used in the conventional type of submarine in the Second World War.

Mr. BROOKS. That statement is correct; and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] for repeating it here. These two submarines are fashioned after the schnorkel-type submarine made famous by the Germans, and the design is very much changed from the standard type of submarine which we used in the Second World War.

Let me say in conclusion that we need these submarines in our Navy. I believe

that aircraft development and submarine development are fundamental to our defense. The keels of these submarines have been laid, one at Portsmouth, N. H., and the other at the Electric Boat Co. in Connecticut. The work is going to be retarded if we do not now authorize this increased amount, and I think it would be little short of folly for us to abandon our effort to go ahead with improved types of submarines so that we can meet the perils of the future which we can all see in the program of the Soviets in developing submarine warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I can think of nothing that is more important in these modern days of technical development than the work that is being done in the matter of undersea craft. It is important that these vital research projects continue. This bill comes to you not only with the unanimous report from the subcommittee, but likewise from the full Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side.

I hope the bill will be speedily enacted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much of the time of the Committee on this bill in the matter of these two ships. I should like to call your attention to the fact that the subcommittee held hearings on the bill and reported it out expeditiously because we knew it would be national suicide for us not to continue expeditiously the construction of this type of warcraft. There is no type of warcraft in the world today to compare with the new type of submarine. We know that the Germans had the schnorkel type submarine, but we have made an improvement on that.

The ordinance alone on these ships costs over \$16,000,000. These things are highly secret, highly necessary to our defense, and highly necessary to our national existence. I know the Committee will pass this bill without one dissenting vote.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 16, 1947 (61 Stat. 96), is hereby amended by deleting the following: "Provided, That the cost of the vessels, the construction of which is authorized by this act, shall not exceed \$30,000,000," and substituting in lieu thereof a period."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "deleting the following" and insert in lieu

thereof the words "amending the proviso to read as follows."

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out all after the word "exceed" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$41,000,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, pursuant to House Resolution 300 reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until Friday midnight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 5632.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, instead of speaking for 5 minutes this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO SHOULD PAY THIS SMALL BILL

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I suggested, Tuesday afternoon of this week, when I asked that this special order be reset for today, that I wished to discuss a matter

which was rather small in itself, but which involved a larger principle. You will agree, as I said then, that when you or I, or any other citizen of the United States, goes to his bank to ask for a loan, one of the factors which the lending agency will take into consideration will be his previous record of paying his debts.

I have been convinced also, over the years, that small items often contribute to the success or failure of what seem to be larger events. The small item I will discuss this afternoon involves the Republic of Mexico, our neighbor to the south, and a debt owed a well-known citizen of my district. I have no desire to create an international incident; in fact, Mr. Speaker, my desire is to prevent an international incident. I think that will be obvious as I discuss the subject.

On November 22, 1930, which you will observe, Mr. Speaker, was 18 years and 8 months ago, the Hulse-Anderson Tractor and Equipment Co., of El Centro, Calif., confirmed by letter—a photostat of which I have in my hand—a contract with the state of Baja California, for 1 Caterpillar 60 tractor, and 2 Caterpillar 30 tractors. These tractors were new, the latest model, and in first-class condition when delivered. There are other details of the contract which are not important at the moment; for example, a stipulation that the seller was to provide an instructor for a reasonable length of time, to instruct the representatives of the buyer in the care and operation of the equipment.

The Governor of Baja California at the time was General Arturo Bernal. His signature, approving the contract, is on the letter which represented the contract instrument, and there is also a notation that the contract number was 343. The total price of the equipment, according to the contract, was to be \$9,640.

The next item that I submit is a statement dated December 31, 1937, which you will observe is 7 years later, showing the accounting to that date. Two payments amounting to \$4,500 had been received against the contract price, but the balance at that time, plus interest, plus a supplementary account for parts purchased during the intervening 7 years, left a balance still due, on December 31, 1937, of \$8,262.42.

No further payment has been made on the account.

This is not a disputed account. The original contract bears the signature of the Governor of Baja California, General Bernal. Payments made against the contract confirm the debt. In order to assure myself that there was no dispute regarding the debt, I asked State Senator Ben Hulse, one of the parties to the contract, as recently as June of this year, to write a letter to the American consul at Mexicali, and ask him again to take up the matter with the present Governor of Baja California for a statement regarding the debt. I submit, as one item of the material for my file, a letter dated June 24, 1949, from Mr. George H. Zentz, the American vice consul at Mexicali,

and from that letter I now quote the following:

Since the administration of Bernal, there have been six other Governors, who apparently have been totally disinterested in the Government's obligation to you. Lic. Castro—

I interrupt to explain that this indicates Licenciado Elias Castro, Lieutenant Governor of the Northern Territory of Baja California, with whom Mr. Zentz talked, in the absence of Governor Gonzalez—

Lic. Castro stated that the present Territorial Government recognizes this obligation and it is their hope and intention to pay off this indebtedness along with certain other commitments made by Bernal, but when they will be able to meet with it is still problematical.

Under the Constitution of Mexico, the governor of a state or territory, is appointed by the President of the Republic, and is responsible to him. The debt of a state is not necessarily the debt of the Republic, but there is an obligation placed upon the Republic, to see that the debt of a state, owed to an individual of another nation, is not permitted to drag for 18 years. You can visualize a similar situation, under which a citizen of, shall we say, France, sold farm equipment to the State of California, or any other State, and the State, after making payment for several years, simply discontinued further payments. The matter would immediately be presented by the Ambassador of France, to the State Department, and from there to the Governor of California, and every effort would be made to see that a just and acknowledged debt was paid promptly. This would be particularly true if the debt were as small as is the debt I am now talking about. All parties concerned would realize that a small incident of this kind could develop itself, if left unchecked, into an incident of larger proportions, to the great embarrassment of the two countries involved. That is the situation we face here.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have a great deal of material here regarding this case. I have no desire to burden the Record with it. The debt was originally incurred in an ordinary business transaction between the governor of Baja California and the agent in the area for the Caterpillar Tractor Co. I wish to pass on to more recent incidents in the situation.

When I came back to the Eighty-first session, I brought the file back with me, and I decided that perhaps the best way to bring the matter to a conclusion would be to suggest to the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington that an informal, and entirely friendly, question should be raised with the representatives of the Republic of Mexico, in connection with any loans which might be requested of that bank. I wrote a letter outlining the situation. Actually, I never mailed that letter, nor did I mail copies of it, as I intended, to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles the appropriations for the Export-Import Bank,

nor to the chairman of the subcommittee which has the appropriation for the State Department. The reason I did not mail the letter, nor other letters on the subject that I had written, including letters to the State Department, was a suggestion which seemed to me to keep this out of the field of possible international complications. A friend of mine, Mr. W. G. Herron, was in my office at the time I was dictating the letters, and I discovered that he knew personally the present Ambassador of Mexico to Washington, Señor de la Colina. I may add that we in California have a very high regard for the present Ambassador, Señor de la Colina, who at one time was the consul general for Mexico on the west coast, and who went through some of the troubled days of the depression with us. None of us in the California delegation would want to do anything to embarrass him. Mr. Herron asked me at that time if I would be willing to withhold the letters and let him talk the matter over personally with the ambassador. I was not only glad to do that, but suggested that he actually consider himself a representative of Senator Hulse in the transaction, so as to make it less formal than it would be if a Member of the Congress of the United States were involved. I can only add that apparently Ambassador de la Colina has made every possible effort to get the debt paid, but that, as of this moment, it still remains unpaid.

The relations between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, in my part of the world, have always been very friendly. If you will picture a small community with the international line running through the middle of it, on one side the United States, on the other side Mexico, with people passing back and forth through the gates with a minimum of inconvenience and control, then you will get something of the picture of the life we lead there. We have a high regard for the Mexican people, and I think those who live south of the border have that same regard for us.

Our friends who live on the Canadian side of the northern line make a great deal of the fact that there is no fence between the United States and Canada. I may say that although technically there is a fence between Mexico and the United States at certain border points, in fact there is no fence, as it has long since been punched full of holes and rotted away. The Immigration Service has been helpful in persuading the State Department to start to rebuild that small section of the fence between Mexicali and Calexico, for a distance of about 4 miles, which lies in the actual city boundaries, but all along the border, outside of the immediate city transfer points, there is in effect no fence. We have never thought we needed one.

I am firmly convinced that a borrower, coming to a lending agency and asking for a loan, should have a record of paying not only big debts, but small debts. I am equally of the opinion that a debtor is entitled to a chance to clear a record, which may be questioned, particularly in

some small item, and I have a firm feeling that in all probability the only reason this debt has not been paid is that it has not yet come somehow to the attention of the proper authority in the Republic of Mexico who will see that it is paid, and at once.

The point I am making is that our relations have always been excellent, and I do not want anything to disturb that relationship.

I have observed over many years of experience that little things like this have a habit of growing into very big things, so I take this rather formal way of calling the attention of the State Department, the necessary agencies of this Government, the Ambassador of this country to Mexico, and the Ambassador of Mexico in this country, to the fact that I believe it is now time for them to see that a small debt is wiped out, that the good relations may be continued, and that the good credit of the Republic of Mexico may not be in any way clouded. For that reason I have brought the matter in this way before you and before the Congress of the United States.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a newspaper, the Pittsburgh Courier, which shows on page 2 a picture of a group of people walking in front of the White House. It is a picket line. I understand that this picket line has been in front of the White House for the past 2 weeks. The pickets are in the main Negroes. There are signs asking President Truman to take Jim Crow off the American dollar and enforce FEPC at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department.

Upon an inquiry, I learned that the reason for this picket line was a most basic one. I learned that some 1,800 women, the vast majority of whom are Negroes, are being denied permanent employment in the jobs that they now hold in this agency because of arbitrary application of the war-service regulations. Many of these women have been employed in these jobs for as long as 7 or 8 years. I learned that these women are picketing the White House because they have been denied the same treatment that has been accorded a group of white workers, the plate printers in the same agency, who secured their permanent status simply by filling out a form for the Civil Service Commission. In other words, they are picketing the White House against racial discrimination. Moreover, I learned that the agency has stated that beginning on August 1 it will start its lay-offs and continue at the rate of 50 dismissals every 2 weeks until the task has been accomplished. They are to be replaced with new, untrained workers at great expense to the American taxpayer.

I have heard for many years of the vast discrimination and Jim Crow in this agency. I understand that the agency's treatment of its Negro veterans of World War II is a shame and a disgrace to this Nation. I learned that even among the women being dismissed that one of them is the widow of a veteran killed in combat in the European theater. These workers have taken their problems to every level of Government with the hope of settlement but they have only been met with evasion and denials. It is conceivable, therefore, that they would, as a last resort, utilize their legal right as citizens of the United States to seek redress of their grievances from their Government by the peaceful method of picketing. What is inconceivable to me is that as this newspaper story states that inquiries by the press at the White House brought forth statements of no comments either on the picket line or on the situation. What is also inconceivable is that the Secretary of Treasury, shortly before his trip to Europe, hastily called a press conference and issued blanket denials that these workers had any grievances. Ironically one of the Secretary's own aides refuted this denial to the press that same day.

We have heard a lot of talk from the President of the United States and from both major parties about the question of civil rights. The time has now passed when statements about civil rights are sufficient. The time is here for action and not words. The best place to begin the application of civil rights for this administration would be among its own employees. The Government must set the example for private industry and all other sections of the Nation insofar as fair-employment practice is concerned. I am, therefore, introducing Mr. Speaker, a resolution calling for an investigation of the situation at the Bureau of Engraving, including the dismissal of these hundreds of women, at this time by Congress. Deeds, not words, will convince the people of this Nation that this Government means business about the constitutional rights of all its citizens for equality of employment and the other civil rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YATES). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROGRESS IN GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION DURING THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Government reorganization has become a watchword of the American people. They want Uncle Sam to put his house in order. The Federal Government is said to be the biggest enterprise on the face of the earth. As stockholders in that enterprise our citizens demand that modern techniques of management be applied for efficient and economical operation. This is a common-sense demand. It stems not from a desire to see essential services of Government reduced, but from a recognition that the vast, complicated, and unwieldy struc-

ture of Government must be overhauled to permit the better performance of these services.

President Truman and the Congress are alert to the need for carrying on the public business with greater efficiency and economy. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Expenditures Committee, I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that substantial progress has been and is being made during the present session of the Congress in reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government. Four enabling statutes have been passed which permit the President and several of the executive departments and agencies to proceed with necessary changes in organization and other important legislation is pending. Eight reorganization plans have been submitted by the President to take effect within 60 days of submission, if not disapproved by either House of Congress.

The job of reorganization cannot be done overnight. We are dealing for the most part with departments and agencies that have grown through many years and in many directions. Some date back to the early days of the Government.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman why, when it says in the reorganization plan that the Congress should adjourn on the 31st of July, and when as a matter of fact it is mandatory, because the word "shall" is used—why is that not done, if this is such a good proposition?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand the gentleman's question. He is referring to the Reorganization Act of 1946 which was a reorganization of the Congress of the United States. I am referring to the Executive Reorganization Act, which is a different act entirely. I prefer not to confuse that with my remarks at the present.

Others have grown up in response to some particular need of the times. All must be examined now and regrouped by major purpose or activity into workable departments which the President can adequately supervise. Wherever possible, duplicating, overlapping, and otherwise unnecessary parts of the governmental structure must be eliminated. Within and among many departments, lines of authority must be redrawn and clearly defined in accord with up-to-date concepts of administration.

In the course of this vast undertaking, numerous studies must be made to insure that basic changes in the structure of government are solidly grounded and capable of meeting present and future needs. Here the work of the Hoover Commission is immensely helpful. Its factual findings and recommendations serve to guide both the President and the Congress in effecting major reorganizations in government. Not the least of its contributions has been to stimulate a greater public interest in public administration.

However, the reports of the Hoover Commission are only the beginning of

this reorganization job. In certain important matters the Commission refrained from making recommendations. Sometimes the members of the Commission could not agree among themselves or with the findings of the task forces that were set up to make specialized studies. The Commission has ended its work and wound up its affairs. Final responsibility as to the wisdom or the feasibility of specific reorganizations lies with the President and the Congress. Accordingly, it is necessary to examine the Hoover Commission reports and studies with a fine-tooth comb, and to supplement or revise them where sound policy dictates.

Considering first the legislative side of reorganization progress, the four reorganization statutes, in order of their enactment, are the following:

First, Public Law 73, enacted May 26, which strengthens the staff of the Secretary of State and prepares the way for integration of the Foreign Service and other personnel of the State Department.

Second, Public Law 36, enacted June 2, which provides for an Under Secretary of Defense. This is a first step in better organization of the armed forces. As the Members well know, additional legislation creating a Department of Defense and proposing major changes in the conduct of the National Military Establishment has been passed in different form by each House. To overcome this impasse and present an alternative, President Truman has submitted a reorganization plan on the military, but legislative action is more appropriate. I hope we can proceed quickly to a satisfactory fulfillment of this urgent legislative task on the military side. In terms of dollar savings, military unification is a large part of the reorganization job. Considering that the armed services now spend about \$15,000,000,000 annually, or one-third of the Federal budget, estimated savings of one and one-half billion dollars a year can be reasonably expected in this field.

Third, Public Law 109, enacted June 20, which directs the President to prepare and transmit to Congress reorganization plans by which agencies may be regrouped, coordinated, consolidated, or otherwise altered—with certain limitations—to promote economical and efficient operation. This law, titled the "Reorganization Act of 1949" is the basic enabling legislation. It permits the exercise of Presidential initiative in reorganization activities. Plans may be submitted by the President up to April 1, 1953, and each such plan will have the effect of law after 60 days, unless a constitutional majority in either House of Congress disapproves. Counting all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission equally, it has been estimated that about 25 percent of the whole reorganization program can be put into effect through Executive action provided for in this law.

Fourth, Public Law 152, enacted June 30, which establishes in the executive branch an agency called the General Services Administration. This law, known as the "Federal Property and Ad-

ministrative Services Act of 1949" deals with the so-called housekeeping functions of the Federal Government. The purchase, storage, and disposal of property, the keeping of records, the management of buildings, and other internal services are brought together under one roof. The new agency takes in the War Assets Administration, the Federal Works Agency, the Bureau of Federal Supply—from the Treasury—the Office of Contract Settlement—also from the Treasury—and the National Archives. Some 27,000 employees are involved in this transfer. The Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report refers to this move as "one of the largest consolidations in Government history."

I am very proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that the law creating the General Services Administration represents careful study and intensive work on the part of our Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization. Here is created the legislative framework for changes that will effect large economies in the Government's housekeeping activities. It has been estimated that in supply activities alone \$250,000,000 can be saved by proper integration. The huge inventory of Federal supplies in warehouses and storage points, value at more than \$27,000,000,000, possibly can be reduced by \$3,000,000,000. Although such estimates always can be debated, it is clear that Uncle Sam as a buyer, user, mover, and seller of goods valued in the billions, should go about his daily business far more efficiently than is now the case. In such fields as records and traffic management, now within the General Services Administration, further substantive legislation to amplify the basic statute will be necessary to insure the maximum benefits of reorganization in housekeeping services, and such legislation is now in course of preparation by our subcommittee.

Promptly upon signing the Reorganization Act of 1949, President Truman submitted to the Congress—June 20—seven reorganization plans. The eighth plan was submitted July 18.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 creates a new Department of Welfare and absorbs the functions and programs of the Federal Security Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 transfers to the Department of Labor the Bureau of Employment Security and related services, now in the Federal Security Agency, and the functions of the Veterans' Placement Service Board.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 transfers to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Post Office Department and authorizes him to delegate appropriate functions to subordinate officers.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 transfers the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 provides for unified direction by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission of the executive affairs of the Commission.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 makes the Chairman of the United States Mari-

time Commission the executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vests in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel and the supervision and direction of their activities.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 transfers the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce.

Reorganization Plan No. 8 constitutes the National Military Establishment an executive Department of Defense and vests in the Secretary of Defense direction, authority, and control over the Department.

It will be noted that the reorganization plans submitted by the President and the legislation enacted or pending in the Congress during 1949 have had two major objectives. These are:

First, Improvement in the general management of the executive branch.

Second, Improvement of the organizational arrangements for the achievement of particular purposes or programs of the Government.

Thus, in the category of changes designed to strengthen general management are Reorganization Plan No. 4 for the transfer of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office, and Reorganization Plan No. 5 for the internal organization of the Civil Service Commission. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act effects a major statutory reorganization in line with the first objective, for it streamlines property administration in the Government and establishes for the first time a General Services Administration charged with various housekeeping functions.

With regard to particular purposes and programs, Reorganization Plan No. 1 will achieve a long-approved objective by converting the Federal Security Agency into a Department of Welfare, and Reorganization Plan No. 3 will substantially improve the internal organization of the Post Office Department. Reorganization Plan No. 2 will take the first step in the direction of strengthening the Department of Labor.

Of considerable significance is Reorganization Plan No. 6, designed to strengthen the office of the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. This agency is by far the largest of those commonly designated as regulatory commissions, and the plan providing for its reorganization is a major step toward establishing a framework for efficient internal administration in the conduct of the Government's merchant marine and shipping responsibilities.

On the legislative side we have the act strengthening the authority of the Secretary of State and providing him with additional top-level assistance in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Proposed amendments to the National Security Act, including the changes contained in Reorganization Plan No. 8 would improve the capacity of the Secretary of Defense to carry out his responsibility for the direction of the military departments. The amendments would have the effect of establishing a Department of Defense in place of the existing

confederated National Military Establishment.

In addition, legislation strengthening the authority of the Postmaster General and providing for the more flexible administration of the Post Office Department has been recommended by the President and is now under consideration by the Congress.

The reorganization plans and legislation which I have mentioned constitute but a partial summary of the reorganization activity launched during 1949. They do indicate, however, the major directions in which progress is being made. If the reorganization plans are allowed to become effective, and if the pending legislation relating to the National Military Establishment and Post Office Department is enacted, the achievements in better management of the Government will be a source of gratification to executive officials, Members of Congress, and the public. Nevertheless, certain major areas touched upon by the Hoover Commission in its reports will remain for further consideration and appropriate action. The principal problem areas toward which attention may well be directed in future months are five in number:

First. Integration of transportation agencies.

Second. Assignment of responsibility for public works planning and construction.

Third. Integration of natural resources activities.

Fourth. Disposition of lending and finance functions.

Fifth. Organization of the medical activities of the Government.

The only reorganization action now pending which relates to any of the preceding five problem areas is Reorganization Plan No. 7 which will transfer the Bureau of Public Roads to the Department of Commerce. Further action must be based on the most careful preparatory investigation and planning. Fundamental reorganizations in these fields affect many agencies of the Government.

It is difficult to estimate the economies which will result from the reorganization legislation and plans which can become effective during this year. As the President has pointed out, the enactment of a law or the approval of a reorganization plan does not of itself produce efficiency or reduce expenditures. However, the ground work is laid for improved administration which over a period of time may lead to substantial economies. How large those savings eventually will prove to be will become evident only after the new organizational arrangements have been in existence for a considerable period of time.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch recognized that the precise magnitude of savings to be derived from changes in administration cannot easily be determined in advance. Very rarely, therefore, did the Commission in its official reports attempt to set forth in dollars and cents the economies expected to result from proposed reorganizations. Mr. Hoover has, however, occasionally referred to specific savings which task forces of the Commission

estimated as likely to follow certain recommended changes. He has stated that a minimum of \$3,000,000,000 per year could be saved if the recommendations of the Commission on Organization were put into effect. Reorganizations believed to contribute most of the attainment of this \$3,000,000,000 in savings are summarized as follows:

Reorganization of the National Military Establishment	\$1,500,000,000
Revamping of Federal personnel policies	600,000,000
Reorganization of supply services	250,000,000
Reorganization of the Post Office Department	300,000,000
Improved records management	16,000,000
Reorganization of the Agriculture Department	44,000,000
Total	2,710,000,000

The \$290,000,000 of additional savings included in the \$3,000,000,000 estimate presumably are to result from reorganizations of other aspects of the business of the Federal Government.

It is of particular interest to note that legislation already passed or pending and reorganization plans now before Congress deal with every one of the six major savings areas listed above except the Department of Agriculture. This does not mean, of course, that the 1949 reorganization program will lead to cover two and one-half billions in economies. It does, however, indicate that attention is being directed to those areas in which observers have concluded that major savings can be attained.

In a fundamental sense, the task of achieving efficient and responsible administration in an organization as complex as the executive branch of the Federal Government is never ending. Changes in the domestic economic situation, in our relations with foreign powers, and in the demands made by the people upon their Government may render obsolete organizational patterns well adapted to the needs of an earlier day. Reorganization, therefore, is not simply a task for 1949 or for 1950. It is a task toward which the President and Congress must unceasingly devote their attention. If both the legislative and executive branches possess the authority and procedures necessary for the swift but orderly adaptation of organizational arrangements to changed conditions, and if they are constantly alert to deficiencies as they appear, it will be possible to assure that high quality of administration which the Nation must have. Both the program of the administration and the actions of Congress during 1949 give encouraging evidence that the need for constant attention to the organization of the executive branch is fully understood.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members may have further information on the background and objectives of the eight reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President, I have prepared individual statements on these plans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to establish a Department of Welfare which will take its place among the principal executive departments, performing the functions and conducting the programs now administered by the Federal Security Agency.

The affairs of the department are to be administered by a Secretary of Welfare, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Provision also is made for one Under Secretary and three Assistant Secretaries to be appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation.

To fix responsibility and clarify lines of authority, all functions of the Federal Security Agency are vested in the Secretary of Welfare, who may delegate appropriate authority to any officer, employee, or to any bureau or other organizational unit of the department.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 accords basically with the Hoover Commission recommendation that a new executive department be created to administer education and welfare activities, and conforms to the Commission's general policy of placing full legal authority and responsibility in the head of the department.

It should be noted that this plan culminates a long history of effort and activity looking to the establishment of a department of welfare. For a quarter century Presidents, special commissions, and students of government have made specific recommendations to that effect. President Harding proposed the establishment of a welfare department in a message to Congress early in 1923. Similar recommendations were made about that time by the Joint (Congressional) Committee on Reorganization of Government Departments and by William F. Willoughby, Director of the Institute for Government Research (now the Brookings Institution).

In 1932 reorganization orders submitted to Congress by President Hoover proposed the grouping of education, health, and welfare activities in one of the existing departments.

In 1937 both the President's Committee on Administrative Management and the Brookings Institution in its report for the Senate Select Committee To Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government (Byrd committee) recommended the creation of a department of welfare to administer these activities. President Roosevelt had the same recommendation in a message to Congress on January 12, 1937, and Senator Robinson introduced a reorganization bill including a provision for a department of welfare.

In 1939 Reorganization Plan No. 1 submitted to the Congress by President Roosevelt provided the nucleus for a department of welfare by bringing together in the Federal Security Agency the previously scattered agencies in charge of welfare activities. The Director of the Budget has recently pointed out that a department of welfare undoubtedly would have been created at that time had not the Reorganization Act of 1939 specifically forbidden the creation of executive departments by reorganization plan.

In 1945 the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress proposed the establishment of a department of social welfare as a means of improving and coordinating relationships between the executive and legislative branches. The following year Reorganization Plan No. 2 submitted to the Congress by President Truman transferred additional welfare activities to the Federal Security Agency.

The Director of the Budget has noted that of eight comprehensive plans for the reorganization of the executive branch developed by

responsible officials and agencies within the last 30 years, six have concentrated the functions as to education, health and welfare in a single department—five of them in a new department devoted exclusively to these activities—and the other two plans have provided for a new department in charge of the greater part of these functions.

According to the Director of the Budget: "It has long been recognized that in practice the Federal Security Agency is a department in virtually all respects except in name and official status, and that the failure to give it its appropriate title and rank is anomalous and unfortunate."

As evidence of the magnitude and importance of this agency, it is pointed out that the agency has more than 35,000 employees and total annual expenditures of more than \$2,000,000,000. Thus the Federal Security Agency outranks three departments in size of personnel and a majority of the civil departments in expenditures. Excluding payments for grants-in-aid and insurance benefits, it still exceeds several departments in volume of expenditures.

Acceptance by the Congress of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 will mark the end of a long series of efforts to establish a Department of Welfare, which many observers agree with President Truman is long overdue.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to strengthen the Department of Labor by transferring to it two major labor programs—employment security and veterans' placement.

The Bureau of Employment Security (including the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Insurance Service) would be transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor. This Bureau administers the activities of the Federal Government with respect to employment services and unemployment insurance, including activities which involve mainly the review and apportionment of grants-in-aid, approval of State plans and grants, the conduct of research and developmental activities, and the provision of advice and assistance to the State agencies which actually conduct the services.

The functions of the Veterans' Placement Service Board, created under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, would be transferred to the Secretary of Labor, and the Board abolished. Although the veterans' employment service functions through the regular employment service, its policies are now determined by an independent board. In order to simplify the administration of the Service and insure the fullest cooperation between it and the general employment service, the elimination of the Board is proposed.

In his message accompanying Reorganization Plan No. 2, President Truman stated:

"One of the major needs of the executive branch is a sound and effective organization of labor functions. More than 35 years ago the Federal Government's labor functions were brought together in the Department of Labor. In recent years, however, the tendency has been to disperse such functions throughout the Government. New labor programs have been placed outside of the Department and some of its basic functions have been transferred from the Department to other agencies.

"In my judgment, this course has been fundamentally unsound and should be reversed. The labor programs of the Federal Government constitute a family of interrelated functions requiring generally similar professional training and experience, involving numerous overlapping problems, and calling for strong, unified leadership. Together they form one of the most important areas of Federal activity. It is imperative

that the Labor Department be strengthened and restored to its original position as the central agency of the Government for dealing with labor problems."

The Hoover Commission unanimously recommended that the Bureau of Employment Security be transferred to the Labor Department.

The dependence of an efficient employment service upon the work of other agencies within the Department of Labor has been emphasized by the Hoover Commission, the President, and the Director of the Budget. Statistical studies on wages, hours, and employment, vocational-counseling aids, information on labor standards and working conditions, analyses of the employment problems of women, learners, and other special groups, are among the Labor Department services which tie in directly with employment-service work. In turn, the employment-office system is expected to furnish up-to-date information on employment and labor-market problems.

Unemployment compensation, the other program of the Bureau of Employment Security, also is closely related to employment service. The Hoover Commission and the President have pointed out that although it is a form of social insurance, unemployment compensation has greater connection, administratively, with job-finding activities than with old-age and survivors' insurance and public-assistance programs administered by the Federal Security Agency.

The purpose of unemployment compensation is to tide workers over limited periods until suitable employment can be obtained. The more effective the employment service, the less drain is made on the compensation fund. In the States this interdependence is recognized by making the same agency responsible for handling employment service and unemployment compensation work. The Director of the Budget has testified that it is very difficult to separate the two programs in the budgets on which Federal grants are based. Furthermore, many States, including such large industrial States as New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, have the employment service and unemployment compensation programs administered by their labor departments.

The Veterans' Employment Service is not abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2, but responsibility is fixed in the head of the department by which the service will be administered after transfer of the Bureau of Employment Security.

At the present time we have an independent Veterans' Placement Service Board determining policies for the Veterans' Employment Service which by law is administered by the United States Employment Service within the Bureau of Employment Security. The Chairman of the Board also appoints the Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service. A Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, originally in the Selective Service System, and now within the Department of Labor, has responsibilities for assisting veterans to find employment. By abolishing the Veterans' Placement Service Board, responsibility for the policies of the Veterans' Employment Service is concentrated in the officer supervising its administration (the Secretary of Labor under the proposed reorganization), thereby eliminating what the Hoover Commission called an "anomalous administrative arrangement".

In sum, the Bureau of Employment Security, including employment service and unemployment compensation activities, and functions relating to veterans' placement all have a logical place in the Department of Labor, as proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 2.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to make a first step in strengthening the organization of

the Post Office Department by giving the Postmaster General authority to organize and control his Department.

The functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Department, including the functions of each Assistant Postmaster General, the Purchasing Agent, the Comptroller, and the Bureau of Accounts, are transferred to the Postmaster General. He is authorized to delegate to subordinates, designated by him, such of his functions as he may deem appropriate.

To provide the Postmaster General with top-level assistance in running the huge business of the Post Office Department, the plan establishes the positions of Deputy Postmaster General and four Assistant Postmaster Generals comparable to the positions of Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries in other departments.

The plan also establishes an Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, composed of the Postmaster General, the Deputy Postmaster General, and seven other members representing the public who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This plan accords with the basic recommendations made by the Hoover Commission in its first and subsequent reports that subordinate officials should not have separate authorities; that is to say, the head of the agency should have full authority to organize and control his department. The Advisory Board for the Post Office Department also follows the Hoover Commission recommendations.

In his accompanying message President Truman pointed out that Reorganization Plan No. 3 puts into effect those of the Hoover Commission recommendations that can be accomplished under the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Further legislation, which the President has proposed, will be necessary to effect other recommendations of the Commission and to place the operations of the Post Office Department on a more business-like basis.

The need to improve the efficiency of the Post Office Department is documented by the Hoover Commission, which points out that a mass of archaic laws and regulations hamper the work of the department, and that its methods of budgeting and appropriation are entirely unsuited to a business operation of this kind and size.

The Commission reported that the Post Office Department's total deficit in 1947 was \$253,000,000 or 20 percent of revenues; in 1948 the deficit was \$310,000,000 or 22 percent of revenues; and in 1949 the deficit is estimated at \$500,000,000, or more than 30 percent of revenues.

Changes in the organization of the Post Office Department were considered as long ago as 1896 when President Cleveland recommended certain improvements to gain the full benefit of the immense sums expended in its administration. From time to time various changes have been suggested to improve the work of the department, leading up to the present reorganization plan and legislative recommendations made by the President.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to improve the staff assistance to the President by transferring the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Since the creation of the Executive Office of the President, the Congress has further recognized the need for more adequate central staff and created two new important staff agencies—the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

The National Security Council was established under Public Law 253, July 26, 1947, to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign and military

policies relating to the national security. In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, it is the duty of the Council—

1. To assess and appraise the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of the National security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

2. To consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

The National Security Resources Board was established by the same act; it is composed of the chairman, who is appointed from civilian life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such heads or representatives of the various departments and agencies as the President may designate. The Board advises the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial and civilian mobilization, including effective use of manpower, civilian economy adjustments, war production and procurement, unified action of war agencies, the relationship between potential supplies and requirements of war goods, etc., strategic and critical materials, and relocation of industries.

In performing these functions, the Board is required to utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of other government agencies. Reorganization Plan No. 4 accords with specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission. In submitting the plan, President Truman stated:

"Since the principal purpose of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board is to advise and assist the President and their work needs to be coordinated to the fullest degree with that of other staff arms of the President, such as the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers, it is highly desirable that they be incorporated in the Executive Office of the President. The importance of this transfer was recognized by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which specifically recommended such a change as one of the essential steps in strengthening the staff facilities of the President and improving the over-all management of the executive branch."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to provide a unified administrative direction by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, while at the same time retaining the advantages of the bipartisan three-member commission.

The plan provides that the President shall from time to time designate one of the Civil Service Commissioners as presiding head of the Commission with the title of Chairman. The Chairman shall, in turn, appoint an executive director under the classified civil service. The titles of President of the United States Civil Service Commission, Secretary of the Commission, Executive Director and Chief Examiner are abolished. The functions of the Chairman are listed as follows:

1. The functions of the President of the Commission.
2. The functions of the Executive Director and Chief Examiner, and of the Secretary of the Commission.
3. The functions of the Commission, with certain specified qualifications, with respect to the appointment of personnel employed by the Commission.
4. The functions of the Commission with respect to the direction of employees of the Commission, the supervision of all activities

of such employees, and the distribution of work among them.

5. The functions of the Commission with respect to directing the preparation of budget estimates and with respect to the use and expenditure of funds.

6. The functions of the Commission with respect to executing, administering, and enforcing the civil-service rules and regulations, and such other activities as classification and retirement, with certain specified exceptions.

The plan recognizes that day-to-day administrative operations should be separated from the regulatory, deliberative, and appellate functions of the Commission. It leaves with the Commission final authority with respect to:

1. Formulation of civil-service rules and regulations.
2. Hearing and action on all types of appeals.
3. Administration of statutes relating to political activity.
4. Investigation of all matters pertaining to the civil service.
5. Recommending measures to the President to promote the more effectual accomplishment of the objectives of the Civil Service Act and rules.

The plan carries out a major recommendation of the Hoover Commission that the Chairman should be given full responsibility for the administrative direction of the work of the Civil Service Commission. It also follows in line both with developments in recent years in the States and cities, and with recommendations made from time to time for improving the personnel organization of the Federal Government.

Back in 1923 the Joint (Congressional) Committee on the Reorganization of Government Departments recognized that the Civil Service Commission must retain the Commission form of organization and continue in independent status, because much of its work was quasi-judicial in character. However, the need for a chief administrative officer, acting as Chairman of the Commission, was pointed out by President Hoover in a message to Congress of February 17, 1932. President Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management recommended the establishment of a Civil Service Administrator together with a nonsalaried Civil Service Board.

President Truman's message accompanying Reorganization Plan No. 5 described the changes in Federal personnel activities which justify its approval:

"The Civil Service Commission was established in 1883 as a three-member body to aid the President in making the civil-service rules and to administer a comparatively simple civil-service system. Each commissioner was made equally responsible under the law for performing the functions assigned to the Commission and the three members functioned as a body in the management of the agency.

"Sixty-six years ago the new agency conducted a single major operating program—the recruitment and examination of candidates for admission to the civil service. Eight executive departments then constituted the entire executive branch. The total Federal employment was about 110,000. That is less than are now employed by any one of the five largest executive agencies.

"Today the work of the Commission is vastly different, reflecting the great changes in the Government itself and the progress that has been made in personnel management, both in Government and private business. To this original job of recruitment and examination, acts of Congress have subsequently added many other operating programs. Two of them in particular involve large-scale operations: The administration of the civil-service retirement system and the administration of the Classification Act. This augmented program applies today to a govern-

ment about 20 times as large as that of 1883, employing men and women drawn from almost every American occupation and profession. The statutory structure of the Civil Service Commission itself, however, has not been adjusted over the years to its changing functions."

As the President further pointed out, the need for this reorganization stems from the Government-wide importance of the civil-service administration. Almost every agency and department is intimately affected, and competence and morale among employees determines the effectiveness of the Government's work. "It is essential," the President said, "that the Commission which directs that system should be effectively organized to discharge its responsibilities."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 6 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to strengthen the administration of the United States Maritime Commission by making the Chairman the chief executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vesting in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel and the supervision and direction of their activities.

The plan transfers from the Commission to the Chairman the functions of the Commission with respect to the following matters:

1. The appointment and supervision of all personnel employed under the Commission.
2. The distribution of business among such personnel and among organizational units of the Commission.
3. The use and expenditure of funds for administrative purposes.

The plan accords with the general recommendation of the Hoover Commission that responsibility for the internal administration of regulatory commissions should be vested in their chairmen.

The United States Maritime Commission was created by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which sought to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, and for other purposes.

The act directs that the Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for staggered terms of 6 years. The Chairman is designated by the President, but the Commission may elect one of its members as vice chairman and is authorized to appoint and fix the salaries of a secretary, a general counsel, and other officials and employees.

On February 7, 1942, under authority of the First War Powers Act, by Executive Order 9054, the President established the War Shipping Administration within the Office of Emergency Management. Certain functions, duties, and powers were transferred from the Maritime Commission to the War Shipping Administration; these powers were transferred back to the Maritime Commission when the War Shipping Administration ceased to exist on September 1, 1946.

In discussing the background of this plan, the President pointed out in his accompanying message: "Unlike other major regulatory commissions, the Maritime Commission is responsible not only for the performance of important regulatory functions but also for the administration of large and complex operating and promotional programs. Whereas the budgets of most regulatory agencies amount to only a few million dollars annually, the expenditures of the Maritime Commission exceed \$130,000,000 a year. As a result of the war the Commission is the owner of a fleet of over 2,300 ships aggregating more than 23,000,000 dead-weight tons."

During the war period, while the above-mentioned transfer of functions under the

First War Powers Act was in effect, the Chairman of the Commission, as War Shipping Administrator, was made directly responsible for the administration of several major operating programs of the Commission. This arrangement, the President observed, proved its value under the stress of war. About a year after the end of the fighting, however, it was terminated and the organization reverted to its prewar pattern.

Following wartime experience, independent studies stressed the need for concentrating in a single official a large part of the Commission's work. In 1948 the Commission appointed a general manager, which resulted in considerable improvement but, as the President noted, "it has not extricated the Commission from administration to the degree which is desirable." Summarizing the advantages of the present plan, the President stated:

"It leaves in the Commission as a body the performance of regulatory functions, the determination of subsidies, and the determination of major policies. Thus, it utilizes the Commission for the type of work for which such a body is best adapted. At the same time the plan places under a single official the day-to-day direction of the work of the staff within the policies and determinations adopted by the Commission in the exercise of its functions. This will provide more businesslike administration and help to overcome the delays, backlogs, and operating difficulties which have hampered the agency. At the same time by freeing the members of the Commission of much detail, the plan will enable them to concentrate on major questions of policy and program and thereby will obtain earlier and better considered resolution of the basic problems of the agency."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to transfer the Public Roads Administration (now the Bureau of Public Roads) from the General Services Administration to the Department of Commerce.

This plan carries out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

The three major reasons for transferring the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce may be summarized as follows:

1. The Department of Commerce is charged by its organic law with the responsibility for promoting transportation and commerce, and the Public Roads Administration, as an agency concerned with the sound development of the Nation's highway system, is directly related to basic responsibilities of the Department of Commerce.

2. The General Services Administration would be unduly burdened in the performance of its central serving functions by retaining the Public Roads Administration, which contains a major Federal program not primarily related to servicing the executive agencies.

In the past fiscal year the Public Roads Administration has expended approximately \$444,000,000, of which some 93 percent is in the form of grants to States. The Public Roads Administration develops standards, reviews projects and State programs, and conducts research. It is believed that to burden the General Services Administration with supervision of this huge and important but unrelated program, would weaken the attention and drive otherwise given to its central area of responsibility, and substantially dilute the major purpose behind the establishment of such an agency.

It is noteworthy that when the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 was considered, both the House and Senate Expenditures Committees indicated that inclusion of the Public Roads Administration in the transfer of the Federal Works Agency to the General Services

Administration was provisional, pending decisions on the consolidation of transportation agencies.

3. The Federal Works Agency, which has had supervision over the Public Roads Administration since 1939, is not a major Federal agency for construction activities or for grants and loans to State and local governments for non-Federal public works. It has been a customary practice of the Congress and the President to assign public-works activities to various Federal agencies in terms of the major program objectives of those agencies. The bulk of direct Federal works (involving direct Federal construction) has been and is being conducted outside of the Federal Works Agency (the only major direct works program in that agency in recent years is public buildings). The Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Veterans' Administration (veterans' hospitals) all have major Federal works programs dwarfing in total the amount centered in the Federal Works Agency. In addition, other agencies have lesser programs for direct Federal works—for example, the Coast Guard in the Treasury Department, the National Advisory Council on Aeronautics, the Alaska Railroad, and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The assignment in relation to specific agency program objectives is even more sharply evident with respect to Federal grants and loans to State and local governments for non-Federal public works. The airport program is assigned to the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the Department of Commerce, the hospital program to the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency, rural electrification to the Department of Agriculture, and housing to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. An exception to this functional pattern is the Bureau of Community Facilities of the General Services Administration (formerly of the Federal Works Agency) in making advances for State and local works planning, and this appears to be due to the fact that this program has no single functional basis but rather is primarily concerned with the possibility of a general emergency public-works program.

Whatever decisions may be subsequently made with respect to the reorganization of the Department of Commerce to integrate transportation activities, or with respect to the assignment of responsibilities for public works planning and execution, Reorganization Plan No. 7 is a logical first move. Noting that the Congress and President Roosevelt were guided by the statutory concept of the Commerce Department's responsibilities toward transportation in transferring to the Department the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Inland Waterways Corporation under the Reorganization Act of 1939, President Truman stated: "A careful review of the structure of the executive branch reveals no other department or agency in which the Public Roads Administration can be so appropriately located."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 8 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to establish a Department of Defense and to clarify and strengthen the responsibility and authority of the Secretary of Defense.

Specific proposals included in the plan are the following:

1. Changes the name of the National Military Establishment to the Department of Defense, and constitutes it an executive department.

2. Gives the Secretary of Defense full control over the organization and administration of the Department and authorizes him to delegate authority to subordinates.

3. Provides for a civilian Deputy Secretary of Defense to assist the Secretary of Defense and to serve in the latter's absence.

4. Provides for three Assistant Secretaries of Defense, drawn from civilian life to perform such activities as the Secretary of Defense may designate.

5. Changes the name of the National Security Council to the Armed Services Policy Council, and makes certain changes in its composition.

6. Establishes the office of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and prescribes the duties thereof.

7. Provides that the Munitions Board and the Research and Development Board shall each, upon request, assist the Secretary of Defense in the performance of his duties.

8. Establishes in the Department of Defense a Personnel Policy Board, prescribes its composition and outlines its duties; i. e., establishment of personnel policies for both military and civilian personnel, coordination of appropriate activities of the Department of Defense with respect to personnel matters, and liaison with the various executive departments and other agencies of the Federal Government for the correlation of personnel activities.

The plan conforms to the basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission that within the National Military Establishment full authority and accountability should be centered in the Secretary of Defense, empowering him to establish policies and programs, to delegate authority where appropriate, and to control the service departments.

Since the Reorganization Act of 1949 prevents the President from abolishing an executive department as such, the plan formally retains executive status for the three service Departments, making them subject, however, to the "direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense," who becomes the head of the Department of Defense.

The Hoover Commission recommendation for a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is also embodied in the plan, except that the Chairman is to be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, rather than by the Secretary of Defense.

Another recommendation of the Commission, that an Under Secretary of Defense and three Assistant Secretaries be established is also included in the plan, except that the plan changes the name of the Under Secretary to Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Other recommendations of the Commission to the effect that the Secretary of Defense should have full control over the preparation and execution of the military budget and should establish uniform budgetary and accounting practices throughout the Military Establishment are not included in the plan, inasmuch as they have been substantially agreed to by both Houses of Congress.

The problem of the organization of the military has been a major concern for more years than most of the people now living can recall. As far back as 1885 President Cleveland called attention in his annual message to the startling abuses and waste in the Navy Department. Practically every President since then has commented on the need for various improvements in organization of the military departments.

In 1922 the Joint (Congressional) Committee on Reorganization recommended the coordination of the Military and Naval Establishments under a single Cabinet officer as the Department of National Defense, with three Under Secretaries for Army, Navy, and National Resources. In 1945 the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress also recommended the setting up of a Department of National Defense.

After various minor improvements through reorganization plans in 1946 and 1947 the National Security Act of 1947 was passed, providing for the setting up of the National Defense Establishment, and taking a further

step in the direction of the unification of the three services into a single defense establishment. As President Truman has pointed out, this act failed to provide for a Department of Defense and for a fully responsible official with authority adequate to meet his responsibilities whom the President and Congress could hold accountable. Lacking also were the basis for an organization and staff adequate to achieve the most efficient and economical defense program and to attain effective and informed civilian control of the armed forces.

On March 5, 1949, the President recommended to the Congress that the National Security Act of 1947 be amended to strengthen and clarify the position of the Secretary of Defense and to provide him with more adequate staff assistance, on the basis of experience gained under the act, the recommendations of the first Secretary of Defense, and the extensive study made by the Hoover Commission.

Legislation substantially embodying the President's recommendations was passed in the Senate, but only a limited part dealing with financial and budgeting matters was accepted in the House. As an alternative to a limited legislative and unsatisfactory program for military reorganization the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 8 on July 18, which would accomplish the major organizational changes represented in the Senate bill. The President expressed in his accompanying message a clear preference for direct legislative action to achieve the desired reorganization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4566. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; and

H. R. 4963. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1184. An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 142. An act excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data;

H. R. 459. An act to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals;

H. R. 585. An act for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson;

H. R. 1127. An act for the relief of Sirikka Siiri Saarelainen;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter;

H. R. 1360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.;

H. R. 2021. An act to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Forces to operate and maintain a certain tract of land at Valparaiso, Fla., near Eglin Air Force Base, as a recreational facility;

H. R. 2474. An act for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard;

H. R. 2799. An act to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retention on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906;

H. R. 2853. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees;

H. R. 3467. An act for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub;

H. R. 3512. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the exemption of certain employees of the Library of Congress and of the judicial branch of the Government whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration;

H. R. 4022. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., to July 31, 1950;

H. R. 4261. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to L. J. Hand a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4646. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to lend certain property to national veterans' organizations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4705. An act to transfer the office of the probation officer of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the office of the Register of Wills for the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Mental Health, from the government of the District of Columbia to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for budgetary and administrative purposes;

H. R. 4804. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; and

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 1, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 281); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

813. A letter from the Comptroller of Currency, Treasury Department, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3113. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5526. A bill to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1758. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 329. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5632. National Security Act Amendments of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5804. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby, until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5805. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, which relates to development of facilities for water storage and utilization in order to promote conservation in arid and semiarid areas, so as to extend such act to all areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5806. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5807. A bill to provide additional compensation, in lieu of overtime pay, for certain Federal employees engaged in criminal law-enforcement work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5808. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise taxes on luggage, jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations, and to terminate the war tax rate on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5809. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 5810. A bill relating to the furnishing of accommodations at Klamath Falls, Oreg., for the United States District Court for the District of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5811. A bill to amend section 1007, title 18, United States Code, with respect to exemption of nonfraudulent transactions under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die of the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution calling for investigation of specific charges of discrimination against Negro employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 301. Resolution disapproving of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. Res. 302. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5472, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5812. A bill to readmit Mr. Angelo Monica to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5813. A bill for the relief of Haralson County Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5814. A bill for the relief of Jan Karszo-Siedlewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Sidney Terry, an individual trading as Midwest Painting Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 5816. A bill for the relief of Reginald Hrachia Devletian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 29, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that daily we are the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence.

We pray that the assurance of Thy continuing care and goodness may in-

spire our minds and hearts with a more vivid sense of social responsibility.

Make us eager to share our blessings, and may they become contributions in our hands with which we shall seek to minister to needy and struggling humanity.

Help us to feel and understand that the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" must be answered conclusively in the affirmative.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 28, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 28, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1429) for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) to provide for the attendance of a joint committee to represent the Congress at the eighty-third and final national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltan
Connally	Kerr	Schoepfel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lodge	Taft
Dulles	Long	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wherry
Graham	Malone	Wiley
Green	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Maybank	Withers
Hayden	Miller	Young
Hendrickson		

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]

and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit petitions and memorials, and present routine matters for the RECORD, as though the Senate were in the morning hour, and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN FOREIGN AREAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth and final report on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, dated July 1949, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BOWMAN COUNTY (N. DAK.) WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Bowman County, N. Dak., relating to the establishment of a Bowman County Water Conservation District.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Bowman County Board of Commissioners hereby requests that the Water Conservation Commission of the State of North Dakota create a Bowman County Water Conservation District, and take all necessary steps toward that end.

Attest:

SUE V. MCINTYRE,
County Auditor.
O. J. SOREIDE,

Chairman, Board of County Commissioners.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the national convention of the American Aid Societies for the Needy and Displaced Persons of Central and Southeastern Europe, New York City, N. Y., relating to amendment of the Displaced Persons Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are many hundred thousand of our kinsfolk among the refugees and expellees now in Germany and Austria, who are excluded from the care of the IRO because of their German ethnic origin; and

Whereas these people were again for that reason excluded from consideration as displaced persons by the DP Act of 1948, although they have fled or were deported from